

13.

THE
DIVINE RIGHT
OF
INFANT BAPTISM,
EXAMINED and DISPROVED, &c.

(Price One Shilling.) 2



THE
DIVINE RIGHT
OF
INFANT BAPTISM,
EXAMINED and DISPROVED;
BEING AN
ANSWER

To a PAMPHLET, Entitled,

*A brief Illustration and Confirmation of
the Divine Right of Infant Baptism.*

Printed at *Boston* in NEW ENGLAND, 1746.

By JOHN GILL, D. D. *K*

L O N D O N :

Printed for, and Sold by J. WARD, in *Little-Britain*;
J. ROBINSON, at *St. Saviour's Dock-head, Southwark*;
and G. KEITH, at *Mercer's-Chapel, Cheapside*.

M D C C X L I X.

65/12/16



The DIVINE RIGHT of *Infant*
Baptism, &c.

C H A P. I.

The Introduction, observing the Author, Title, Method and Occasion of writing the Pamphlet under Consideration.

MANY being converted under the Ministry of the Word in *New-England*, and enlightned into the Ordinance of Believers Baptism, whereby the Churches of the Baptist Persuasion at *Boston* and in the Country have been much increased, has alarmed the Pædobaptist Ministers of that Colony; who have applied to one Mr. *Dickenson*, a Country Minister, who, as my Correspondent informs me, has wrote with some Success against the *Arminians*, to write in favour of Infant-Sprinkling; which Application he thought fit to attend unto, and accordingly wrote a Pamphlet on that Subject; which has been printed in several Places, and several Thousands have been published, and great pains have been taken to spread them about, in order to hinder the Growth of the

Baptist Interest. This Performance has been transmitted to me, with a Request to take some notice of it by way of Reply, which I have undertook to do.

The Running Title of the Pamphlet, is *The Divine Right of Infant Baptism*; but if it is of Divine Right, it is of God; and if it is of God, if it is according to his Mind, and is instituted and appointed by him, it must be notified some where or other in his Word; wherefore the Scriptures must be searched into, to see whether it is so, or no; and upon the most diligent Search that can be made, it will be found that there is not the least Mention of it in it; that there is no Precept enjoining it, or directing to the Observation of it; nor any Instance, Example, or Precedent encouraging such a Practice; nor any thing there said or done, that gives any reason to believe it is the Will of God, that such a Rite should be observed; wherefore it will appear to be entirely an human Invention, and as such to be rejected. The Title Page of this Work promises an *Illustration and Confirmation* of the said Divine Right; but if there is no such thing, as it is certain there is not, the Author must have a very difficult Task to illustrate and confirm it; how far he has succeeded in this Undertaking, will be the Subject of our following Enquiry.

The Writer of the Pamphlet under consideration has chose to put his Thoughts together

gether on this Subject, in the form of a *Dialogue* between a *Minister* and one of his *Parishioners*, or *Neighbours*. Every Man, that engages in a Controversy, may write in what Form and Method he will ; but a By-stander will be ready to conclude, that such a way of writing is chose, that he may have the opportunity of making his Antagonist speak what he pleases ; and indeed he would have acted a very unwise Part, had he put Arguments and Objections into his Mouth, which he thought he could not give any tolerable answer to ; but, inasmuch as he allows the Person the Conference is held with, to be not only a *Man of Piety and Ingenuity*, but of considerable reading, he ought to have represented him throughout, as answering to such a character ; whereas, whatever *Piety* is shewn in this Debate, there is very little *Ingenuity* discovered ; since, for the most part, he is introduced as admitting the weak Reasonings of the Minister, at once, without any further Controversy ; or if he is allowed to attempt a Defence of the Cause and Principles he was going over to, he is made to do it in a very mean and trifling manner ; and, generally speaking, what he offers is only to lead on to the next thing that presents itself in this Dispute : Had he been a Man of considerable reading, or had he read Mr. *Stennett*, and some others of the *Antipædobaptist* Authors, as is said he had, which had occasioned his Doubt about his Baptism, he

would have known what Answers and Objections to have made to the Minister's Reasonings, and what Arguments to have used in favour of Adult Baptism, and against Infant Sprinkling. What I complain of is, that he has not made his Friend to act in Character, or to answer the Account he is pleased to give of him : However, he has a double End in all this Management ; on the one hand, by representing his Antagonist as a Man of Ingenuity and considerable Reading, he would be thought to have done a very great Exploit in convincing and silencing such a Man, and reducing him to the Acknowledgment of the Truth ; and, on the other hand, by making him talk so weakly, and so easily yielding to his Arguments, he has acted a wise Part, and taken care not to suffer him to say such things, that he was not able to answer ; and which, as before observed, seems to be the view of writing in this Dialogue way.

C H A P. II.

Of the Consequences of renouncing Infant Baptism.

THE Minister, in order to frighten his Parishioner out of his Principle of Adult Baptism, he was inclined to, suggests terrible Consequences that would follow upon it ; as his renouncing his Baptism in his Infancy ;

fancy; vacating the Covenant between God and him, he was brought into thereby; renouncing all other Ordinances of the Gospel, as the Ministry of the Word, and the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; that upon this Principle, Christ, for many Ages, must have forsaken his Church, and not made good his Promise of his Presence in this Ordinance; and that there could be no such thing, as Baptism in the World now, neither among *Pædobaptists*, nor *Antipædobaptists*.

1st, The first dreadful Consequence following upon a Man's espousing the Principle of Believers Baptism, is a Renunciation of his Baptism; not of the Ordinance of Baptism, that he cannot be said to reject and renounce; for when he embraces the Principle of Adult Baptism, and acts up to it, he receives the true Baptism, which the Word of God warrants and directs unto, as will be seen hereafter: But it seems it is a Renunciation of his Baptism in his Infancy; and what of that? it should be proved first, that that is Baptism, and that it is good and valid, before it can be charged as an Evil to renounce it; it is right to renounce that which has no Warrant or Foundation in the Word of God: But what aggravates this supposed Evil is, that in it a Person in his early Infancy is dedicated to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; it may be asked, by whom is the Person in his Infancy dedicated to God, when Baptism is said to be administered

nistred to him? Not by himself, for he is ignorant of the whole Transaction; it must be either by the Minister, or his Parents: The Parents indeed desire the Child may be baptized, and the Minister uses such a Form of Words, *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; but what Dedication is here made by the one, or by the other? However, seeing there is no Warrant from the Word of God, either for such Baptism, or Dedication; a Renunciation of it need not give any Uneasiness to any Person so baptized and dedicated.

2dly, To embrace Adult Baptism, and to renounce Infant Baptism, is to vacate the Covenant into which a Person is brought into by his Baptism, *p. 4.* by which Covenant the Writer of the Dialogue means the Covenant of Grace, as appears from all his After-reasonings from thence to the Right of Infants to Baptism.

1. He supposes that unbaptized Persons are, as to their external and visible Relation, Strangers to the Covenants of Promise; are not in Covenant with God; not so much as visible Christians; but in a State of Heathenism; without Hope of Salvation, but from the uncovenanted Mercies of God, *p. 4, 5, 6.* The Covenant of Grace was made from everlasting; and all interested in it were in Covenant with God, as early, and so previous to their Baptism, as to their secret Relation God-wards; but this may be thought to

to be sufficiently guarded against by the Restriction and Limitation, "as to external and visible Relation:" But I ask, are not all truly penitent Persons, all true Believers in Christ, though not as yet baptized, in Covenant with God, even as to their external and visible Relation to him, which Faith makes manifest? Were not the three Thousand in Covenant with God visibly, when they were pricked to the Heart, and repented of their Sins, and gladly received the Word of the Gospel, promising the Remission of them, though not as yet baptized? Was not the Eunuch in Covenant with God? or was he in a State of Heathenism, when he made that Confession of his Faith, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, previous to his going down into the Water, and being baptized? Were the Believers in *Samaria*, or those at *Corinth*, in an uncovenanted State, before the one were baptized by *Philip*, or the other by the Apostle *Paul*? Was *Lydia*, whose Heart the Lord opened, and who attended to the Things that were spoken; and the Jaylor that believed and rejoiced in God, with all his House, in an uncovenanted State, before they submitted to the Ordinance of Baptism? Are there not some Persons, that have never been baptized, of whom there is reason to believe they have an Interest in the Covenant of Grace? Were not the Old Testament Saints in the Covenant of Grace, before this Rite of Baptism took place? Should

it be said, that Circumcision did that then, which Baptism does now, enter Persons into Covenant, which equally wants Proof, as this; it may be replied, that only commenced at a certain Period of Time; was not always in use, and belonged to a certain People only; whereas there were many before that, who were in the Covenant of Grace, and many after, and even at the same time it was enjoined, who yet were not circumcised; of which more hereafter: From all which it appears, how false that Assertion is,

2. That a Man is brought into Covenant by Baptism, as this Writer affirms; seeing the Covenant of Grace is from everlasting; and those that are put into it, were put into it so soon; and that by God himself, whose sole Prerogative it is. Parents cannot enter their Children into Covenant, nor Children themselves, nor Ministers by sprinkling Water upon them; it is an Act of the sovereign Grace of God, who says, *I will be their God, and they shall be my People*: The Phrase of *bringing into the Bond of the Covenant*, is but once used in Scripture; and then it is ascribed to God, and not to the Creature; not to any Act done by him, or done to him, *Ezekiel* xx. 37. and much less,

3. Can this Covenant be vacated, or made null and void, by renouncing Infant Baptism: The Covenant of Grace is ordered in all Things, and sure; its Promises are Yea and Amen in Christ; its Blessings are the sure Mercies

Mercies of *David*; God will not break it, and Men cannot make it void; it is to everlasting, as well as from everlasting; those that are once in it can never be put out of it; nor can it be vacated by any thing done by them. This Man must have a strange Notion of the Covenant of Grace, to write after this rate; he is said to have wrote against the *Arminians* with some Success; if he has, it must be in a different manner from this; for upon this Principle, that the Covenant of Grace may be made null and void by an Act of the Creature, how will the Election of God stand sure? or the Promise of the Covenant be sure to all the Seed? What will become of the Doctrine of the Saints Perseverance? or of the Certainty of Salvation to those that are chosen, redeemed, and called?

3dly, Another Consequence said to follow, on espousing the Principle of Adult Baptism, and renouncing that of Infants, is a renouncing all other Ordinances of the Gospel, as the Ministry of the Word, and the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, practically denying the Influences of the Spirit in them, and all Usefulness, Comfort, and Communion by them. All which this Author endeavours to make out, by observing, that if Infant Baptism is a Nullity, then those, who have received no other, if Ministers, have no Right to administer Sacred Ordinances, being unbaptized; and,

if private Persons, they have no Right to partake of the Lord's Supper, for the same Reason; and so all public Ordinances are just such a Nullity as Infant Baptism; and all the Influences of the Spirit, in Conversion, Comfort, and Communion, by them, must be practically denied, *p.* 5, 6. To which may be replied, That though upon the Principle of Adult Baptism, as necessary to the Communion of Churches, it follows, that no unbaptized Person is regularly called to the Preaching of the Word, and Administration of Ordinances, or can be a regular Communicant; yet it does not follow, that a Man that renounces Infant Baptism, and embraces Believers Baptism, must renounce all other Ordinances, and look upon them just such Nullities as Infant Baptism is, and deny all the Comfort and Communion he has had in them; because the Word may be truly preached, and the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, be duly administered by an irregular Man, and even by a wicked Man; yea, may be made useful for Conversion and Comfort; for the Use and Efficacy of the Word and Ordinances, do not depend upon the Minister or Administrator; but upon God himself, who can, and does, sometimes make use of his own Word, for Conversion, though preached by an irregular, and even an immoral Man, and of his own Ordinances, for Comfort, by such an one to his People, though they may be irregular

lar and deficient in some Things, through Ignorance and Inadvertency.

4thly, Another Consequence following upon this Principle, as supposed, is, That if Infant Baptism is no Institution of Christ, and to be rejected, then the Promise of Christ, to be with his Ministers in the Administration of the Ordinance of Baptism, to the End of the World, *Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.* is not made good; since, for several Ages, even from the fourth to the sixteenth Century, Infant Baptism universally obtained, *p. 6, 7, 8.* To which the following Answer may be returned. That the Period of Time pitched upon for the Prevalence of Infant Baptism is very unhappy for the Credit of it, both as to the Beginning and End; as to the Beginning of it, in the fourth Century, a Period in which Corruption in Doctrine and Discipline flowed into the Church, and the Man of Sin was ripening a-pace, for his Appearance; and likewise as to the End, the Time of the Reformation, in which such Abuses began to be corrected: The whole is a Period of Time, in which the true Church of Christ began gradually to disappear, or to be hidden, and at last fled into the Wilderness; where she has not been forsaken of Christ, but is, and will be, nourished, for a Time, and Times, and half a Time; this Period includes the gross Darknes of Popery, and all the Depths of Satan; and which to suffer

was no ways contrary to the Veracity of Christ, in his Promise to be with his true Church and faithful Ministers, to the End of the World. Christ has no where promised, that his Doctrines and Ordinances should not be perverted; but, on the contrary, has given clear and strong Intimations, that there should be a general Falling-away and Departure from the Truth and Ordinances of the Gospel, to make way for the Revelation of Antichrist; and though it will be allowed, that during this Period Infant Baptism prevailed, yet it did not universally obtain. There were Witnesses for Adult Baptism in every Age, and Christ had a Church in the Wilderness, in Obscurity, at this Time; namely, in the Valleys of *Piedmont*, who were, from the Beginning of the Apostacy, and witnessed against it, and bore their Testimony against Infant Baptism, as will be seen hereafter, and with these his Presence was; nor did he promise it to any, but in the faithful Ministration of his Word and Ordinances, which he has always made good; and it will lie upon this Writer and his Friends, to prove the gracious Presence of Christ, in the Administration of Infant Baptism.

5thly, It is said, That, upon these Principles, rejecting Infant Baptism, and espousing Believers Baptism, it is not possible there should be any Baptism at all in the World, either among *Pædobaptists*, or *Antipædobaptists*;

baptists; the Reason of this Consequence is; because the Madmen of *Munster*, from whom this Writer dates the first Opposition to Infant Baptism; and the first *Antipædobaptists* in *England* had no other Baptism than what they received in their Infancy; that Adult Baptism must first be administered by unbaptized Persons, if Infant Baptism is no Ordinance of Christ, but a mere Nullity; and so by such as had no Claim to the Gospel Ministry, nor Right to administer Ordinances; and consequently the whole Succession of the *Antipædobaptist* Churches must remain unbaptized to this Day; and so no more Baptism among them, than among the *Pædobaptists*, until there is a new Commission from Heaven, to renew and restore this Ordinance, which is, at present, lost out of the World, p. 6, 8, 9. As for the Madmen of *Munster*, as this Writer calls them, and the Rise of the *Antipædobaptists* from them, and what is said of them I shall consider in the next Chapter. The *English Antipædobaptists*, when they were first convinced of Adult Baptism, and of the Mode of administering it by Immersion, and of the Necessity of setting a Reformation on foot, in this Matter, met together, and consulted about it; when they had some Difficulties thrown in their way, about a proper Administrator to begin this Work; some were for sending Messengers to foreign Churches, who were the Successors of the
antient

antient *Waldenses* in *France* and *Bobemia*; and accordingly did send over some, who being baptized, returned and baptized others. And this is a sufficient Answer to all that this Writer has advanced. But others thought that this was a needless Scruple, and looked too much like the Popish Notion of an uninterrupted Succession, and a Right conveyed through that to administer Ordinances; and therefore judged, in such a Case as theirs, there being a general Corruption as to this Ordinance, that an unbaptized Person, who appeared to be otherwise qualified, to preach the Word, and administer Ordinances, should begin it; and justified themselves upon the same Principles that other Reformers did, who, without any regard to an uninterrupted Succession, set up new Churches, ordained Pastors, and administered Ordinances: It must be owned, that in ordinary Cases, he ought to be baptized himself, that baptizes another, or preaches the Word, or administers other Ordinances; but in an extraordinary Case as this, of beginning a Reformation, from a general Corruption, where such an Administrator cannot be had, it may be done; nor is it essential to the Ordinance that there should be such an Administrator, or otherwise it could never have been introduced into the World at all at first; the first Administrator must be an unbaptized Person, as *John the Baptist* was. According

cording to this Man's Train of Reasoning,
 there never was, nor could be any valid
 Baptism in the World; for *John*, the first
 Administrator, being an unbaptized Person,
 the whole Succession of Churches from that
 Time to this Day must remain unbaptized.
 It will be said, that he had a Commis-
 sion from Heaven to begin this new Or-
 dinance; and a like one should be shewn
 for the Restoration of it. To which I an-
 swer, That there being a plain Direction
 for the Administration of this Ordinance, in
 the Word, there was no need of a new
 Commission to restore it from a general
 Corruption; it was enough for any Person
 sensible of the Corruption, to attempt a Re-
 formation, and to administer it in the right
 Way, who was satisfied of his Call from God,
 to preach the Gospel, and administer Ordi-
 nances, according to the Word. I shall
 close this Chapter with the Words of *Zan-
 chy*^a, a Protestant Divine, and a *Pædobap-
 tist*, and a Man of as great Learning and
 Judgment, as any among the first Reform-
 ers: "It is a fifth Question (he says) pro-
 posed by *Augustin. contra Parmen. l. 2.*
 " *c. 13. col. 42.* but not solved, Whether
 " he that never was baptized may baptize
 " another; and of this Question he says,
 " (i. e. *Austin*) nothing is to be affirmed
 " without the Authority of a Council.

^a *Quinta quæstio proponitur ab Augustino &c. Explicat.*
Epist. ad Ephes. c. 5. p. 225.

“ Nevertheless, *Thomas (Aquinas)* takes
 “ upon him to determine it, from an An-
 “ swer of Pope *Nicholas*, to the Enquiries
 “ of the *Dutch*, as it is had in *Decr. de*
 “ *Consec. dist. 4. can. 22.*” where we thus
 read ; “ You say, by a certain *Jew*,
 “ whether a Christian or a Heathen you
 “ know not, (*i. e.* whether baptized or un-
 “ baptized) many were baptized in your
 “ Country, and you desire to know what is
 “ to be done in this Case ; truly if they are
 “ baptized in the Name of the Holy Tri-
 “ nity, or only in the Name of Christ, they
 “ ought not to be baptized again.” And
Thomas confirms the same, by a Saying
 of *Isidore*, which likewise is produced in
 the same Distinction, *can. 21.* where he
 says, “ that the Spirit of Christ ministers
 “ the Grace of Baptism, though he be a
 “ Heathen that baptizes. Wherefore, says
 “ *Thomas*, if there should be two Persons
 “ not yet baptized, who believe in Christ,
 “ and they have no lawful Administrator,
 “ by whom they may be baptized, one may,
 “ without Sin, be baptized by the other ;
 “ the Necessity of Death obliging to it.
 “ All this (adds *Zanchy*) proceeds from
 “ hence, that they thought Water Baptism
 “ absolutely necessary ; but what cannot be
 “ determined by the Word of God, we
 “ should not dare to determine. But (says
 “ he) I’ll propose a Question, which, I
 “ think, may be easily answered ; Suppos-
 “ ing

“ ing a *Turk* in a Country where he could
 “ not easily come at Christian Churches ;
 “ he, by reading the New Testament, is
 “ favoured with the Knowledge of Christ,
 “ and with Faith ; he teaches his Family,
 “ and converts that to Christ, and so others
 “ likewise ; the Question is, whether he
 “ may baptize them whom he has con-
 “ verted to Christ, though he himself ne-
 “ ver was baptized with Water Baptism ?
 “ I don’t doubt but he may ; and, on the
 “ other hand, take care that he himself be
 “ baptized, by another of them that were
 “ converted by him ; the Reason is, because
 “ he is a Minister of the Word, extraordi-
 “ narily raised up by Christ ; so that such a
 “ Minister may, with them, by the Consent
 “ of the Church, appoint a Colleague, and
 “ take care that he be baptized by him.” The
 Reason which *Zancky* gives, will, I think, hold
 good in the Case of the first *Antipædobaptists*
 in *England*.

C H A P. III.

*Of the Antiquity of Infant Baptism ; when first
debated ; and concerning the Waldenses.*

THE Minister, in this Dialogue, in order
 to stagger his Neighbour about the
 Principle of Adult Baptism, he had espoused,
 suggests to him, that Infant Baptism did uni-
 versally obtain in the Church, even from the
 D Apostles

Apostles Times ; that undoubted Evidence may be had from the antient Fathers, that it constantly obtained in the truly primitive Church ; and that it can't be pretended that this Practice was called in question, or made Matter of Debate in the Church, till the Madmen of *Munster* set themselves against it ; and affirms, that the antient *Waldenses* being in the constant Practice of Adult Baptism, is a mere Imagination, a chimerical one, and to be rejected as a groundless Figment, *p. 7, 9.*

I. This Writer intimates, that the Practice of Infant Baptism universally and constantly obtained in the truly primitive Church. The truly primitive Church is the Church in the Times of Christ and his Apostles. The first Christian Church was that at *Jerusalem*, which consisted of such as were made the Disciples of Christ, and baptized ; first made Disciples by Christ, and then baptized by his Apostles ; for *Jesus* himself baptized none, only they baptized by his Order, *John* iv. 1, 2. *Acts* i. 15. This Church afterwards greatly increased ; three thousand Persons, who were pricked to the Heart under *Peter's* Ministry, repented of their Sins, and joyfully received the good News of Pardon and Salvation by Christ, were baptized, and added to it ; these were adult Persons ; nor do we read of any one Infant being baptized, while this truly primitive Church subsisted. The next Christian Church was that at *Samaria* ; for that there was a Church there, is evident from *Acts* ix. 31.

This

This seems to have been founded by the Ministry of *Philip*; the original Members of it were Men and Women baptized by *Philip*, upon a Profession of their Faith in the Things preached by him, concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of *Jesus Christ*, *Acts* viii. 12. nor is there the least Intimation given that Infant Baptism at all obtained in this Church. Another truly primitive Christian Church, was the Church at *Philippi*; the Foundation of which was laid in the two Families of *Lydia* and the Gaoler, and which furnish out no Proof of Infant Baptism obtaining here, as we shall see hereafter; for *Lydia's* Household are called Brethren, whom the Apostles visited and comforted; and the Gaoler's Household were such as were capable of hearing the Word, and who believed in Christ, and rejoiced in God as well as he, *Acts* xvi. 14, 15, 32, 33, 34, 40. So that it does not appear that Infant Baptism obtained in this Church. The next Christian Church we read of, and which was a truly primitive one, is the Church at *Corinth*, and consisted of Persons who, hearing the Apostle *Paul* preach the Gospel, believed in Christ, whom he preached, and were baptized, *Acts* xviii. 8. but there is no Mention made of any Infant being baptized, either now or hereafter, in this truly primitive Church State. These are all the truly primitive Churches, of whose Baptism we have any Account in the *Acts of the Apostles*, excepting *Cornelius*, and his Family

and Friends, who very probably founded a Church at *Cæsarea*; and the twelve Disciples at *Ephesus*, who very likely joined to the Church there, and who are both Instances of Adult Baptism, *Acts* x. 48. and xix. 1.—7. Let it be made appear, if it can, that any one Infant was ever baptized in any of the above truly primitive Churches, or in any other during the Apostolic Age, either at *Antioch* or *Thessalonica*, at *Rome*, or at *Colosse*, or any other primitive Church of those Times. But though this can't be made out from the Writings of the New Testament, we are told,

II. That undoubted Evidence may be had from the antient Fathers, that Infant Baptism constantly obtained in the truly primitive Church. Let us a little enquire into this Matter.

I. The Christian Writers of the first Century, besides the Evangelists and Apostles, are *Barnabas*, *Hermas*, *Clemens Romanus*, *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*. As to the two first of these, *Barnabas* and *Hermas*, the learned Mr. *Stennet*^b has cited some Passages out of them; and after him Mr. *David Rees*^c; for which Reason, I forbear transcribing them; which are manifest Proofs of Adult Baptism, and that as performed by Immersion; they represent the Persons baptized, the one^d as hoping in the Cross of Christ, the other^e as having heard the

^b Answer to *Russen*, p. 142, 143. ^c Answer to *Walker*, p. 157, &c. ^d *Barnabæ Epist.* c. 9. p. 235, 236. Ed. *Voss*.
^e *Hermæ Pastor*, l. 1. vis. 3. f. 7. & l. 3. f. 16.

the Word, and being willing to be baptized in the Name of the Lord; and both as going down into the Water, and coming up out of it. *Clemens Romanus* wrote an Epistle to the *Corinthians*, still extant; but there is not a Syllable in it about Infant Baptism. *Ignatius* wrote Epistles to several Churches, as well as to particular Persons; but makes no Mention of the Practice of Infant Baptism in any of them: What he says of Baptism, favours Adult Baptism; since he speaks of it as attended with Faith, Love, and Patience: "Let your Baptism (says he^f) remain as Armour; Faith as an Helmet, Love as a Spear, and Patience as whole Armour." *Polycarp* wrote an Epistle to the *Philippians*, which is yet in being; but there is not one Word in it about Infant Baptism. So that it is so far from being true, that there is undoubted Evidence from the antient Fathers, that this Practice universally and constantly obtained in the truly primitive Church, that there is no Evidence at all that it did obtain, in any respect, in the first Century, or Apostolic Age; and which is the only Period in which the truly primitive Church of Christ can be said to subsist. There is indeed a Work called *The Constitutions of the Apostles*, and sometimes the *Constitutions of Clemens*, because he is said to be the Compiler of them; and another Book of *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ascribed to *Dionysius the Areopagite*, out of which, Passages have been cited

^f *Ignatii Epist. ad Polycarp. p. 14. Ed. Voss.*

cited in favour of Infant Baptism ; but these are manifestly of later Date than they pretend to, and were never written by the Persons whose Names they bear, and are condemned as spurious by learned Men, and are given up as such by Dr. Wall, in his *History of Infant Baptism* §.

2. The Christian Writers of the second Century, which are extant, are *Justin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus of Antioch*, *Tatian*, *Minutius Felix*, *Irenæus*, and *Clemens of Alexandria* ; and of all these Writers, there is not one that says any Thing of Infant Baptism ; there is but one pretended to, and that is *Irenæus* ; and but a single Passage out of him ; and that depends upon a single Word, the Signification of which is doubtful at best ; and besides the Passage is only a Translation of *Irenæus*, and not expressed in his own original Words ; and the Chapter, from whence it is taken, is by some learned Men judged to be spurious ; since it advances a Notion inconsistent with that antient Writer, and notoriously contrary to the Books of the Evangelists, making Christ to live to be fifty Years old, yea, to live to a senior Age : The Passage, produced in favour of Infant Baptism, is this ; speaking of Christ, he says ^h,
 “ Sanctifying every Age, by that Likeness it had
 “ to him ; for he came to save all by himself ; all,
 “ I say, *qui per eum renascuntur in Deum*, who
 “ by him are born again unto God ; Infants,
 “ and little ones, and Children, and young
 Men,

§ Part I. c. 23.

^h Irenæus adv. Hæres. l. 2. c. 39. p. 191.

“ Men, and old Men; therefore he went
 “ through every Age, and became an Infant,
 “ to Infants sanctifying Infants; and to little
 “ Ones a little One, sanctifying those of that
 “ Age; and likewise became an Example of
 “ Piety, Righteousness, and Subjection:” Now,
 the Question is about the Word *renascuntur*,
 whether it is to be rendered *born again*, which
 is the literal Sense of the Word, or *baptized*;
 the true Sense of *Irenæus* seems to be this, that
 Christ came to save all, that are regenerated by
 his Grace and Spirit; and none but they, ac-
 cording to his own Words, *John* iii. 3, 5. and
 that by assuming human Nature, and passing
 through the several Stages of Life, he has sanc-
 tified it, and set an Example to Men of every
 Age. And this now is all the Evidence, the
 undoubted Evidence of Infant Baptism, from
 the Fathers of the first two Centuries; it would
 be easy to produce Passages out of the above
 Writers, in favour of Believers Baptism; I shall
 only cite one out of the first of them; the
 Account, that *Justin Martyr* gave to the Empe-
 ror *Antoninus Pius* of the Christians of his
 Day; though it has been cited by Mr. *Stennet*
 and Mr. *Rees*, I shall choose to transcribe it;
 because, as Dr. *Wall* saysⁱ, it is the most an-
 tient Account of the Way of baptizing next the
 Scripture. “ And now, says *Justin*^k, we will
 “ declare after what Manner, when we were
 “ renewed by Christ, we devoted ourselves unto
 “ God;

ⁱ History of Infant Baptism, Part I. c. 2. ^k Οὐ τρεπόμεν δὲ
 ἀνέσθκαμεν αὐτοῦς, &c. *Justin. Apolog.* II. p. 93, 94. Ed. Paris.

“ God; lest, omitting this, we should seem to
 “ act a bad Part in this Declaration. As
 “ many, as are persuaded, and believe the
 “ Things, taught and said by us, to be true,
 “ and promise to live according to them, are
 “ instructed to pray, and to ask fasting, the
 “ Forgiveness of their past Sins of God, we
 “ praying and fasting together with them. Af-
 “ ter that, they are brought by us, where
 “ Water is, and they are regenerated in the
 “ same Way of Regeneration, as we have been
 “ regenerated; for they are then washed in
 “ Water, in the Name of the Father and Lord
 “ God of all, and of our Saviour *Jesus Christ*,
 “ and of the Holy Spirit.” There is a Work,
 which bears the Name of *Justin*, called *Answers to the Orthodox, concerning some necessary Questions*; to which we are sometimes referred for a Proof of Infant Baptism; but the Book is spurious, and none of *Justin's*, as many learned Men have observed; and as Dr. *Wall* allows; and is thought not to have been written before the fifth Century. So stands the Evidence for Infant Baptism, from the ancient Fathers of the first two Centuries.

3. As to the third Century, it will be allowed, that it was spoken of in it; though as soon as it was mentioned, it was opposed; and the very first Man that mentions it, speaks against it; namely, *Tertullian*. The Truth of the Matter is, that Infant Baptism was moved for in the third Century; got Footing and Establishment in the fourth and fifth; and so prevailed

ailed until the Time of the Reformation : Though, throughout these several Centuries, there were Testimonies bore to Adult Baptism; and at several Times, certain Persons rose up, and opposed Infant Baptism; which brings me,

III. To consider what our Author affirms, that it cannot be pretended that this Practice was called in question, or made Matter of Debate in the Church, until the mad Men of *Munster* set themselves against it, *p.* 7. let us examine this Matter, and,

I. It should be observed, that the Disturbances in *Germany*, which our *Pædobaptist* Writers so often refer to in this Controversy about Baptism, and so frequently reproach us with, were first begun in the Wars of the Boors, by such as were *Pædobaptists*, and them only; first by the *Papists*, some few Years before the Reformation; and after that, both by *Lutherans* and *Papists*, on account of civil Liberties; among whom, in Process of Time, some few of the People called *Anabaptists* mingled themselves; a People that scarce in any Thing agree with us, neither in their civil, nor religious Principles; nor even in Baptism itself; for if we can depend on those, that wrote the History of them, and against them; they were for repeating Adult Baptism, not performed among them; yea, that which was administred among themselves, when they removed their Communion to another Society; nay, even in the same Community, when an excommunicated Person

E

was

was received again¹; besides, if what is reported of them is true, as it may be, their Baptism was performed by sprinkling, which we cannot allow to be true Baptism; it is said, that when a Community of them was satisfied with the Person's Faith and Conversation, who proposed for Baptism, the Pastor took Water into his Hand, and sprinkled it on the Head of him, that was to be baptized, using these Words, *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*^m: And even the Disturbances in *Munster*, a famous City in *Westphalia*, were first begun by *Bernard Rotman*, a *Pædobaptist* Minister of the *Lutheran* Persuasion, assisted by other Ministers of the Reformation, in opposition to the Papists in the Year 1532; and it was not till the Year 1533, that *John Matthias* of *Harlem*, and *John Bocolodus* of *Leyden* came to this Placeⁿ; who, with *Knipperdolling* and others, are, I suppose, the Madmen of *Munster*, this Writer means; and he may call them Madmen, if he pleases; I shall not contend with him about it; they were mad Notions which they held, and mad Actions they performed; and both disavowed by the People, who are now called *Anabaptists*; though it is not reasonable to suppose, that these were the only Men concerned in that Affair, or that the Number of their Followers should increase to such a Degree in so small a time, as to make such a Revolution in so large

a

¹ Cloppenburg. Gangræna, p. 366. Spanhem. Diatribe Hist. Sect. 27. ^m Budneus apud Meshov. Hist. Anabapt. l. 4. p. 96. ⁿ Sleidan. Comment. l. 10. p. 267, 269. Spanhem. Diatribe Histor. de Origine Anabaptist. Sect. 18.

a City: However certain it is that, it was not their Principle about Baptism, that led them into such extravagant Notions and Actions: But what I take notice of all this for, is chiefly to observe the Date of the Confusions and Distractions, in which these Madmen were concerned; which were from the Year 1533 to 1536: And our next Enquiry therefore is, whether there was any Debate about the Practice of Infant Baptism before this Time. And,

2. It will appear, that it was frequently debated, before these Men set themselves against it, or acted the mad Part they did: In the Years 1532 and 1528, there were publick Disputations at *Berne* in *Switzerland*, between the Ministers of the Church there and some *Anabaptist* Teachers^o; in the Years 1529, 1527 and 1525, *Oecolampadius* had various Disputes with People of this Name at *Basil* in the same Country^p; in the Year 1525, there was a Dispute at *Zurich* in the same Country about *Pædobaptism*, between *Zwinglius*, one of the first Reformers, and Dr. *Balthasar Hubmeierus*^q, who afterwards was burnt, and his Wife drowned at *Vienna*, in the Year 1528; of whom *Meshovius*^r, though a Papist, gives this Character; that he was from his Childhood brought up in Learning; and for his singular Erudition was honoured with a Degree in Divinity; was a very eloquent Man, and read in

E 2

the

^o Spanhem. *ibid.* Sect. 14. Meshov. *Anabaptist. Histor.* l. 3. c. 16, 18. ^p Spanhem. Sect. 13. Meshovius, *ibid.* c. 2. ^q Spanhem. Sect. 11. Meshov. l. 2. c. 4. ^r *Ibid.* c. 15.

the Scriptures, and Fathers of the Church. *Hoornbeck* ^a calls him a famous and eloquent Preacher, and says he was the first of the Reformed Preachers at *Waldshut*: There were several Disputations with others in the same Year at this Place; upon which an Edict was made by the Senate at *Zurich*, forbidding Re-baptization, under the Penalty of being fined a Silver Mark, and of being imprisoned, and even drowned, according to the Nature of the Offence. And in the Year 1526, or 1527, according to *Hoornbeck*, *Felix Mans*, or *Mentz*, was drowned at *Zurich*; this Man, *Meshovius* says ^t, whom he calls *Felix Mantfcher*, was of a noble Family; and both he, and *Conrad Grebel*, whom he calls *Cunrad Grebbe*, who are said to give the first Rise to *Anabaptism* at *Zurich*, were very learned Men, and well skilled in the *Latin*, *Greek*, and *Hebrew* Languages. And the same Writer affirms, that *Anabaptism* was set on foot at *Wittenberg*, in the Year 1522, by *Nicholas Pelargus*, or *Stork*, who had Companions with him of very great Learning, as *Caroloſtadius*, *Philip Melancthon*, and others; this, he says, was done, whilst *Luther* was lurking as an Exile in the Castle of *Wartpurg* in *Thuringia*; and that when he returned from thence to *Wittenberg*, he banished *Caroloſtadius*, *Pelargus*, *More*, *Didymus*, and others ^u, and only received *Melancthon* again. This carries the Opposition to *Pædobaptism* within

^a Summa Controvers. l. 5. p. 356.

^t Meshov. l. 2. c. 1.

^u Ibid. l. 1. c. 2, 3.

within five Years of the Reformation, begun by *Luther* ; and certain it is, there were many and great Debates about Infant Baptism at the first of the Reformation, Years before the Affair of *Munster* : And evident it is, that some of the first Reformers were inclined to have attempted a Reformation in this Ordinance, though they, for reasons best known to themselves, dropped it ; and even *Zwinglius* himself, who was a bitter Persecutor of the People called *Anabaptists* afterwards, was once of the same Mind himself, and against *Pædobaptism*. But,

3. It will appear, that this was a Matter of Debate, and was opposed before the Time of the Reformation. There was a Sett of People in *Bohemia*, near a hundred Years before that, who appear to be of the same Persuasion with the People, called *Anabaptists* ; for in a Letter, written by *Costececius* out of *Bohemia* to *Erasmus*, dated *Octob. 10, 1519^w*, among other Things said of them, which agree with the said People, this is one ; “ such as come over
“ to their Sect, must every one be baptized
“ anew in meer Water ;” the Writer of the Letter calls them *Pyghards*, so named, he says, from a certain Refugee, that came thither 97 Years before the Date of the Letter. Pope *Innocent* the Third, under whom was the *Lateran* Council, A. D. 1215, has, in the Decretals, a Letter, in Answer to a Letter from the
Bishop

^w Inter Colomesf. Collect. apud Wall's History of Infant Baptism, Part II. p. 200.

Bishop of *Arles* in *Provence*, which had represented to him^z, that "Some Hereticks there had taught, that it was to no Purpose to baptize Children, since they could have no Forgiveness of Sins thereby, as having no Faith, Charity, &c." So that it is a clear Point, that there were some that set themselves against Infant Baptism in the *Thirteenth* Century, three hundred Years before the Reformation; yea, in the *Twelfth* Century there were some that opposed *Pædobaptism*. Mr. *Fox*, the Martyrologist, relates from the History of *Robert Guisburne*^y, that two Men, *Gerhardus* and *Dulcinus* in the Reign of *Henry* the Second, about the Year of our Lord, 1158; who, he supposes, had received some Light of Knowledge of the *Waldenses*, brought thirty with them into *England*; who, by the King and the Prelates, were all burnt in the Forehead, and so driven out of the Realm; and after were slain by the *Pope*. *Rapin*^z calls them *German* Hereticks, and places their coming into *England*, at the Year 1166; But *William* of *Newbury*^a calls them *Publicans*, and only mentions *Gerhardus*, as at the Head of them; and whom he allows to be somewhat learned, but all the rest very illiterate, and says they came from *Gascoigne*; and being convened before a Council, held at *Oxford* for that Purpose; and being interrogated concerning

Articles

^x Opera Innocent. Tertii, Tom. II. p. 776. apud Wall, ibid. p. 178. ^y Acts and Monuments, Vol. I. p. 262. ^z History of England, Vol. I. p. 233. ^a Neubrigenfis de Rebus Anglicanis, l. 2. c. 13. p. 155.

Articles of Faith, said perverse Things concerning the Divine Sacraments, detesting Holy Baptism, the Eucharist and Marriage: And his Annotator *Picardus*, out of a M. S. of *Radulph*, the Monk, shews, that the Hereticks, called *Publicans*, affirm, that we must not pray for the dead; that the Suffrages of the Saints were not to be asked; that they believe not Purgatory; with many other Things; and particularly, *asserunt isti Parvulos non baptizandos donec ad intelligibilem perveniant Ætatem*. “ They assert that Infants are not to be baptized; till they come to the Age of Understanding^b. In the Year 1147, *St. Bernard* wrote a Letter to the Earl of *St. Gyles*, complaining of his harbouring *Henry*, an Heretick; and among other Things he is charged with by him, are these; “ the Infants of Christians “ are hindered from the Life of Christ, the “ Grace of Baptism being denied them; nor “ are they suffered to come to their Salvation, “ though our Saviour compassionately cries out “ in their Behalf, *Suffer little children to come to me, &c.*” and, about the same time, writing upon the *Canticles*, in his 65th and 66th Sermons, he takes notice of a Sort of People, he calls *Apostolici*; and who, perhaps, were the Followers of *Henry*; who, says he, laugh at us for baptizing Infants^c; and among the Tenets which he ascribes to them, and attempts to confute, this is the first, “ Infants are not to “ be baptized:” In Opposition to which, he affirms,

^b Not. in Ibid. p. 720—723.

^c Wall, *ibid.* p. 175, 176.

affirms, that Infants are to be baptized in the Faith of the Church; and endeavours, by Instances, to show, that the Faith of one is profitable to others^d; which he attempts from *Matth.* ix. 2. and xv. 28. *1 Tim.* ii. 15. In the Year 1146, *Peter Bruis*, and *Henry* his Follower, set themselves against Infant Baptism. *Petrus Cluniacensis*, or *Peter* the Abbot of *Clugny*, wrote against them; and among other Errors he imputes to them, are these: “ That Infants are not baptized, or saved by
 “ the Faith of another, but ought to be baptized, and saved by their own Faith; or that
 “ Baptism without their own Faith does not
 “ save; and that those, that are baptized in
 “ Infancy, when grown up, should be baptized again; nor are they then rebaptized,
 “ but rather rightly baptized:” And that these Men did deny Infant Baptism, and pleaded for Adult Baptism, Mr. *Stennet*^f has proved from *Cassander* and *Prateolus*, both *Pædobaptists*: And Dr. *Wall*^g allows these two Men to be *Antipædobaptists*; and says, they were
 “ the first *Antipædobaptist* Preachers, that ever
 “ set up a Church, or Society of Men, holding that Opinion against Infant Baptism, and
 “ rebaptizing such, as had been baptized in
 “ Infancy;” and who also observes^h, that the *Lateran* Council, under *Innocent* the II^d, 1139, did condemn *Peter Bruis*, and *Arnold* of *Brescia*, who seems to have been a Follower of
Bruis,

^d Hist. Eccl. Magdeburg. Cent. XII. c. 5. p. 338, 339.

^e Ibid. p. 332. ^f Answer to Ruffen, p. 83, 84. ^g History of Infant Baptism, Part II. p. 184. ^h Ibid. p. 179.

Bruis, for rejecting Infant Baptism: Moreover, in the Year 1140, or a little before it, *Everwinus*, of the Diocese of *Cologne*, wrote a Letter to *St. Bernard*; in which he gives him an Account of some Hereticks, lately discovered in that Country; of whom he says, “ they condemn the Sacraments, except Baptism only; “ and this only in those, who are come to Age; “ who, they say, are baptized by Christ himself, whoever be the Minister of the Sacraments; they do not believe Infant Baptism; “ alledging that Place of the Gospel, *he that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved*.”

These seem also to be the Disciples of *Peter Bruis*, who began to preach about the Year 1126; so that it is out of all doubt, that this was a Matter of Debate, four hundred Years before the Madmen of *Munster* set themselves against it: And a hundred Years before these, there were two Men, *Bruno*, Bishop of *Angiers*, and *Berengarius*, Archdeacon of the same Church, who began to spread their particular Notions about the Year 1035; which chiefly respected the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper. What they said about the former, may be learned from the Letter sent by *Deodwinus*, Bishop of *Liege*, to *Henry I.* King of *France*; in which are the following Words^k: “ There is a Report come out of *France*, and “ which goes through all *Germany*, that these “ two (*Bruno* and *Berengarius*) do maintain, that “ the Lord’s Body (the *Host*) is not the Body,

F

“ but

^l Wall, *ibid.* p. 172.

^k Apud Wall, *ibid.* p. 159.

“ but a Shadow and Figure of the Lord’s
 “ Body ; and that they do disannul lawful
 “ Marriages ; and, as far as in them lies, over-
 “ throw the Baptism of Infants :” And from
Guimundus, Bishop of *Aversa*, who wrote
 against *Berengarius*, who says, “ That he did
 “ not teach rightly concerning the Baptism of
 “ Infants, and concerning Marriage¹.” Mr.
Stennet^m relates from Dr. *Allix*, a Passage con-
 cerning one *Gundulphus* and his Followers in
Italy ; divers of whom, *Gerard*, Bishop of
Cambray and *Arras*, interrogated upon several
 Heads in the Year 1025. And, among other
 Things, that Bishop mentions the following
 Reason, which they gave against Infant Bap-
 tism ; “ because to an Infant, that neither wills,
 “ nor runs, that knows nothing of Faith, is ig-
 “ norant of its own Salvation and Welfare ; in
 “ whom there can be no desire of Regeneration,
 “ or Confession ; the Will, Faith and Confession
 “ of another seem not in the least to appertain.”
 Dr. *Wall*, indeed, represents these Men, the
 Disciples of *Gundulphus*, as *Quakers* and *Ma-
 nichees* in the Point of Baptism ; holding that
 Water Baptism is of no Use to any : But it
 must be affirmed, whatever their Principles
 were, that their Argument against Infant Bap-
 tism was very strong. So then we have Testi-
 monies, that *Pædobaptism* was opposed five
 hundred Years before the Affair of *Munster*.
 And if the *Pelagians*, *Donatists*, and *Luciferi-
 ans*,

¹ Hist. Eccl. Magdeburg, Cent. XI. c. 5. p. 116. ^m Answer
 to Ruffen, p. 84, 85.

ans, so called from *Lucifer Calaritanus*, a very orthodox Man, and a great Opposer of the *Arians*, were against Infant Baptism, as several *Pædobaptist* Writers affirm; this carries the Opposition to it still higher; and indeed it may seem strange, that since it had not its Establishment; 'till the Times of *Austin*, that there should be none to set themselves against it: And if there were none, how comes it to pass, that such a Canon should be made in the *Millevitan* Council, under Pope *Innocent* the First, according to *Carranza*ⁿ; and in the Year 402, as say the *Magdeburgensian* Centuriators^o; or be it in the Council at *Carthage*, in the Year 418, as says Dr. *Wall*^p, which runs thus, " Also, " it is our Pleasure, that whoever denies that " new-born Infants are to be baptized; or says, " they are indeed to be baptized for the Re- " mission of Sins; and yet they derive no ori- " ginal Sin from *Adam* to be expiated by the " washing of Regeneration; (from whence it " follows, that the Form of Baptism for the " Forgiveness of Sins in them, cannot be un- " derstood to be true, but false) let him be " Anathema:" But if there were none, that opposed the Baptism of new-born Infants, why should the first Part of this Canon be made, and an Anathema annexed to it? To say that it respected a Notion of a single Person in *Cyprian's* Time, 150 Years before this, that Infants were not to be baptized, until eight Days old; and

F 2

that

ⁿ Summa Concil. p. 122, 123. ^o Cent. V. c. 9. p. 468.
^p History, &c. Part II. p. 275, 276.

that it seems, there were some People still of this Opinion, wants Proof. But however certain it is, that *Tertullian*¹, in the beginning of the Third Century, opposed the Baptism of Infants, and dissuaded from it, who is the first Writer that makes Mention of it: So it appears, that as soon as ever it was set on foot, it became Matter of Debate; and sooner than this, it could not be: And this was thirteen hundred Years before the Madmen of *Munster* appeared in the World. But,

IV. Let us next consider the Practice of the ancient *Waldenses*, with respect to Adult Baptism, which this Author affirms to be a chimerical Imagination, and groundless Figment. It should be observed, that the People called *Waldenses*, or the *Vaudois*, inhabiting the Valleys of *Piedmont*, have gone under different Names, taken from their principal Leaders and Teachers; and so this of the *Waldenses*, from *Peter Waldo*, one of their *Barbs*, or Pastors; though some think, this Name is only a Corruption of *Vallenses*, the Inhabitants of the Valleys: And certain it is, there was a People there before the Times of *Waldo*, and even from the Apostles Time, that held the pure Evangelick Truths, and bore a Testimony to them in all Ages, and throughout the dark Times of Popery, as many learned Men have observed²; and the Sense of these People,

¹ De Baptismo, c. 18. ² Dr. Allix's Remarks on the ancient Churches of Piedmont, p. 188, 207, 210, 286. Morland's History of the Evangelical Churches of the Vallies of Piedmont, B. I. c. 3. p. 8, &c. Et Bezae Icones apud Ibid. Introduction to the History, p. 7.

ple, concerning Baptism, may be best understood,

1. By what their antient Barbs or Pastors taught concerning it. *Peter Bruis*, and *Henry* his Successor, were both, as *Morland* affirms^s, their antient Barbs and Pastors; and from them these People were called *Petrobrussians* and *Henricians*; and we have seen already, that these two Men were *Antipædobaptists*, denied Infant Baptism, and pleaded for Adult Baptism. *Arnoldus* of *Brixia*, or *Brescia*, was another of their Barbs, and is the first mentioned by *Morland*, from whom these People were called *Arnoldists*. Of this Man Dr. *Allix* says^t, that besides being charged with some ill Opinions, it was said of him, that he was not found in his Sentiments concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, and the Baptism of Infants; and Dr. *Wall* allows^u, that the *Lateran* Council, under *Innocent* the Second, 1139, did condemn *Peter Bruis*, and *Arnold* of *Brescia*, who seems to have been a Follower of *Bruis*, for rejecting Infant Baptism. *Lollardo* was another of their Barbs, who, as *Morland* says, was in great Reputation with them, for having conveyed the Knowledge of their Doctrine into *England*, where his Disciples were known by the Name of *Lollards*; who were charged with holding, that the Sacrament of Baptism used in the Church by Water, is but a light Matter, and of small Effect; that Christian People be suf-

^s History, B. I. ch. 8. p. 184. ^t Remarks, &c. p. 171, 172. ^u History of Infant Baptism, Part II. p. 179.

sufficiently baptized in the Blood of Christ, and need no Water; and that Infants be sufficiently baptized, if their Parents be baptized before them *: All which seem to arise from their denying of Infant Baptism, and the Efficacy of it to take away Sin.

2. By their antient Confessions of Faith, and other Writings which have been published. In one of these, bearing Date *A. D.* 1120, the 12th and 13th Articles run thus †: “ We do
 “ believe that the Sacraments are Signs of the
 “ holy Thing, or visible Forms of the in-
 “ visible Grace; accounting it good that the
 “ *Faithful* sometimes use the said Signs, or
 “ visible Forms, if it may be done. However,
 “ we believe and hold, that the abovesaid
 “ *Faithful* may be saved without receiving
 “ the Signs aforesaid, in case they have no
 “ Place, nor any Means to use them. We
 “ acknowledge no other Sacrament but Bap-
 “ tism and the Lord’s Supper.” And in another antient Confession, without a Date, the 7th Article is ‡: “ We believe that in the Sa-
 “ crament of Baptism, Water is the visible and
 “ external Sign, which represents unto us that
 “ which (by the invisible Virtue of God operating) is within us; namely, the Renova-
 “ tion of the Spirit, and the Mortification of
 “ our Members in Jesus Christ; *by which also*
 “ *we are received into the holy Congregation of*
 “ *the People of God, there protesting and de-*
 “ *claring*

* Fox’s Afts and Monuments, Vol. I. p. 868. † Morland’s History, &c. B. I. ch. 4 p. 34. ‡ Ib. p. 38.

“ *clarifying openly our Faith and Amendment of Life.*” In a Tract ^a, written in the Language of the antient Inhabitants of the Valleys, in the Year 1100, called *The Noble Lesson*, are these Words; speaking of the Apostles, it is observed of them, “ they spoke without Fear of the Doctrine of Christ; they preached to *Jews and Greeks*, working many Miracles, and *those that believed* they baptized in the Name of *Jesus Christ*.” And in a Treatise concerning *Antichrist*, which contains many Sermons of the Barbs, collected in the Year 1120, and so speaks the Sense of their antient Pastors before this Time, stands the following Passage ^b: “ The third Work of *Antichrist* consists in this, that he attributes the Regeneration of the Holy Spirit, unto the dead outward Work (or Faith) *baptizing Children in that Faith*, and teaching, that thereby Baptism and Regeneration must be had, and therein he confers and bestows Orders and other Sacraments, and groundeth therein all his Christianity, which is against the Holy Spirit.” There are indeed two Confessions of theirs, which are said to speak of Infant Baptism; but these are of a late Date, both of them in the sixteenth Century; and the earliest is not a Confession of the *Waldenses* or *Vaudois* in the Valleys of *Piedmont*, but of the *Bohemians*, said to be presented to *Ladislav* King of *Bohemia*, A. D. 1508, and after-

^a Morland's History, &c. ch. 6. p. 99, 112.
p. 142, 148.

^b Ib. ch. 7.

afterwards amplified and explained, and presented to *Ferdinand* King of *Bobemia*, A. D. 1535; and it should be observed, that those People say, that they were falsely called *Waldenses*^c; whereas it is certain there were a People in *Bobemia* that came out of the Valleys, and sprung from the old *Waldenses*, and were truly so, who denied Infant Baptism, as that Sort of them called *Pyghards*, or *Picards*; who, near a hundred Years before the Reformation, as we have seen by the Letter sent to *Erasmus* out of *Bobemia*, rebaptized Persons that joined in Communion with them; and *Scultetus*^d, in his Annals on the Year 1528, says, that the united Brethren in *Bobemia*, and other godly Persons of that Time, were rebaptized; not that they patronized the Errors of the *Anabaptists*, (meaning such that they were charged with which had no relation to Baptism) but because they could not see how they could otherwise separate themselves from an unclean World. The other Confession is indeed made by the Ministers and Heads of the Churches in the Valleys, assembled in *Angrogne*, September 12th, 1532^e. Now it should be known, that this was made after that “*Peter Masson* and “*George Morell* were sent into *Germany* in the “Year 1530, as *Morland* says^f, to treat with the “chief Ministers of *Germany*, viz. *Oecolampadius*, “*Bucer*, and others, touching the Reformation
“ of

^c Morland's History, ch. 4. p. 43.
Summa Controvers. l. 5. p. 387.
p. 39.

^f Ibid. ch. 8. p. 185.

^d Apud Hoornbeck.
^e Morland, *ibid.* ch. 4.

“ of their Churches ; but *Peter Masson* was
 “ taken Prisoner at *Dijon*.” However, as *Fox*
 says^g, “ *Morell* escaped, and returned alone to
 “ *Merindol* with the Books and Letters he
 “ brought with him from the Churches of
 “ *Germany* ; and declared to his Brethren all
 “ the Points of his Commission ; and opened
 “ unto them, how many and great Errors they
 “ were in ; into the which their old Ministers,
 “ whom they called *Barbs*, that is to say *Un-*
 “ *cles*, had brought them, leading them from
 “ the right Way of true Religion.” After
 which, this Confession was drawn up, signed,
 and swore to : From hence, we learn, where
 they might get this Notion, which was now
 become Matter of great Debate in *Switzerland*
 and *Germany* ; and yet, after all this, I am in-
 clined to think, that the Words of the Article
 in the said Confession, are to be so understood,
 as not to relate to Infant Baptism : They are
 these^h ; “ We have but two sacramental Signs
 “ left us by *Jesus Christ* ; the one is Baptism ;
 “ the other is the Eucharist, which we receive,
 “ to shew that our Perseverance in the Faith,
 “ is such, as we promised, when we were bap-
 “ tized, being little Children.” This Phrase,
being little Children, as I think, means, their
 being little Children in Knowledge and Expe-
 rience, when they were baptized ; since they
 speak of their receiving the Eucharist, to shew
 their Perseverance in the Faith, they then had

G

promised

^g Acts and Monuments, Vol. II. p. 186. ^h Morland, Ibid.
 c. 4. p. 41.

promised to persevere in: Besides, if this is to be understood of them, as Infants in a literal Sense; what Promise were they capable of making, when such? Should it be said, that they promised by their Sureties, it should be observed, that the *Waldenses* did not admit of God-fathers and God-mothers in Baptism; this is one of the Abuses their ancient *Barbs* complained of in Baptism, as administered by the *Papists*¹. Besides, in a brief Confession of Faith, published by the reformed Churches of *Piedmont*, so late as A. D. 1655, they have these Words in favour of Adult Baptism^k; “ that
 “ God does not only instruct and teach us by
 “ his Word, but has also ordained certain Sa-
 “ craments to be joined with it, *as a Means to*
 “ *unite us unto Christ, and to make us Parta-*
 “ *kers of his Benefits.* And there are only two
 “ of them belonging in common *to all the*
 “ *Members of the Church* under the New Testa-
 “ ment; to wit, *Baptism* and the Lord’s Sup-
 “ per; that God has ordained the Sacrament
 “ of Baptism to be a Testimony of our Adop-
 “ tion, and of our being cleansed from our Sins
 “ by the Blood of *Jesus Christ*, and renewed
 “ in Holiness of Life:” Nor is there one Word
 in it of Infant Baptism. Upon the whole, it
 will be easily seen, what little Reason the Wri-
 ter of the Dialogue under consideration had to
 say, that the ancient *Waldenses*, being in the
 constant Practice of Adult Baptism, is a chi-
 merical Imagination, and a groundless Fiction;
 since

¹ Morland, *Ibid.* c. 7. p. 173.

^k *Ibid.* c. 4. p. 61, 67.

since there is nothing appears to the contrary, but that they were in the Practice of it until the Sixteenth Century; for what is urged against it, is since that Time: And even at that Time, there were some, that continued in the Practice of it; for *Ludovicus Vives*, who wrote in the said Century, having observed, that “ formerly
 “ no Person was brought to the Holy Baptis-
 “ tery, ’till he was of Adult Age, and when he
 “ both understood what that mystical Water
 “ meant, and desired to be washed in it, yea, de-
 “ fired it more than once,” adds the following Words; “ I hear in some Cities of *Italy*, the
 “ old Custom is still in a great measure pre-
 “ served.” Now, what People should he mean by some Cities of *Italy*, unless the Remainers of the *Petrobrussians*, or *Waldenses*, as *Dr. Wall*^m observes, who continued that Practice in the Valleys of *Piedmont*: And it should be observed, that there were different Sects, that went by the Name of *Waldenses*, and some of them of very bad Principles; some of them were *Manichees*, and held other Errors: And indeed, it was usual for the *Papists* in former Times, to call all by this Name, that dissented from them; so that it need not be wondred at, if some, bearing this Name, were for Infant Baptism, and others not. The *Vaudois* in the Valleys, are the People chiefly to be regarded; and it will not be denied, that of late Years In-

G 2

fant

¹ Audio in quibusdam Italiæ Urbibus morem veterem magna ex parte adhuc conservari, Comment. in Aug. de Civ. Dei, Lib. I. c. 27. ^m History of Infant Baptism, Part II. c. 2. p. 12.

fant Baptism has obtained among them : But that the ancient *Waldenses* practised it, wants Proof.

C H A P. IV.

The Argument for Infant Baptism, taken from the Covenant made with Abraham, and from Circumcision the Sign of it, considered.

THE Minister in this Debate, in answer to his Neighbour's requiring a plain Scripture Institution of Infant Baptism, tells him ; if he would " consider the Covenant of Grace, " which was made with *Abraham*, and with " all his Seed, both after the Flesh, and after " the Spirit, and by God's express Command " to be sealed to Infants, he would there find " a sufficient Scripture Instance for Infant Baptism : " And for this Covenant he directs him to *Gen. xvii. 2, 4, 7, 10, 12.* He argues, that this Covenant was a Covenant of Grace ; that it was made with all *Abraham's* Seed, natural and spiritual ; *Jews* and *Gentiles* ; that Circumcision was the Seal of it ; and that the same Institution, which requires Circumcision to be administered to Infants, requires Baptism to be also administered to them, that succeeding Circumcision, *p. 10—18.* Wherefore,

First, The leading Enquiry is, whether the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen. xvii.* was the Covenant of Grace ; that is, the pure Covenant of Grace, in distinction from the Covenant
of

of Works; which is the Sense in which it is commonly understood, and in which this Writer seems to understand this Covenant with *Abraham*; for of it, he says, *p.* 13. " it was the " Covenant of Grace, that Covenant by which " alone we can have any grounded Hope of " Salvation:" But that it was *the* Covenant of Grace, or a pure Covenant of Grace must be denied: For,

1. It is never called the Covenant of Grace, nor by any Name which shews it to be so; it is called *the Covenant of Circumcision*, which God is said to give to *Abraham*, Acts vii. 8. but not a Covenant of Grace; Circumcision and Grace are opposed to one another; Circumcision is a Work of the Law, which they that sought to be justified by, fell from Grace, *Gal.* v. 2, 3, 4.

2. It seems rather to be a Covenant of Works, than of Grace; for this was a Covenant to be kept by Men. *Abraham* was to keep it, and his Seed after him were to keep it; something was to be done by them; they were to circumcise their Flesh; and not only he and his Seed were to be circumcised, but all that were born in his House, or bought with his Money; and a severe Penalty was annexed to it: In case of Neglect, or Disobedience, such a Soul was to be cut off from his People, *Gen.* xvii. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. All which favour nothing of a Covenant of Grace, a Covenant by which we can have a grounded Hope of Salvation, but the contrary.

3. This was a Covenant that might be broken, and in some Instances were, *Gen. xvii. 14.* but the Covenant of Grace cannot be broken; God will not break it, *Pf. lxxxix. 34.* nor Man cannot: It is a Covenant ordered in all Things, and sure; it cannot be moved; it stands firmer than Hills, or Mountains.

4. It must be owned, that there were temporal Things promised in this Covenant, such as a Multiplication of *Abraham's* natural Seed; a Race of Kings from him, with many Nations, and a Possession of the Land of *Canaan*, *Gen. xvii. 6, 8.* Things which can have nothing to do with the pure Covenant of Grace, any more than the Change of his Name from *Abram* to *Abraham*, ver. 5.

5. There were some Persons, included in this Covenant made with *Abraham*, of whom it cannot be thought they were in the Covenant of Grace, as *Ishmael*, *Esau*, and others; and, on the other Hand, there were some, and even living at the Time when this Covenant was made, and yet were not in it; who, nevertheless, were in the Covenant of Grace, as *Arphaxad*, *Melchizedeck*, *Lot*, and others; wherefore this can never be reckoned the pure Covenant of Grace.

6. The Covenant of Grace was only made with Christ, as the federal Head of it; and who is the only Head of the Covenant, and of the Covenant-ones; wherefore, if the Covenant of Grace was made with *Abraham*, as the federal Head of his natural and spiritual Seed, of *Jews* and

and *Gentiles*; then there must be two Heads of the Covenant of Grace, contrary to the Nature of such a Covenant, and the whole Current of Scripture: Yea, this Covenant of *Abraham's*, so far as it respected his spiritual Seed, or spiritual Blessings for them, it and the Promises were made to Christ, *Gal. iii. 16*. No mere Man is capable of covenanting with God, of Stipulation and Restipulation; for what has Man to restipulate with God? The Covenant of Grace is not made with any single Man; and much less with him, on the Behalf of others: When, therefore, at any Time we read of the Covenant of Grace, being made with a particular Person, or with particular Persons, it must always be understood of making it manifest to them; of a Revelation of the Covenant, and of an Application of Covenant Blessings to them; and not of any original Contract with them, for that is only made with them in Christ. To which may be added,

7. That the Covenant of Grace was made with Christ, and with his People, as considered in him from everlasting; for so early was Christ set up as the Mediator of it; the Promise of eternal Life in it, was before the World was; and those interested in it, were blessed with all spiritual Blessings and Grace before the Foundation of it; now could there be a Mediator so early, a Promise of eternal Life so soon, and Blessings of Grace provided, and no Covenant subsisting? Wherefore the Covenant made with *Abraham* in Time, could not, strictly and properly

perly speaking, be the Covenant of Grace.
But,

8. To shorten this Debate, it will be allowed, that the Covenant made with *Abraham* was a peculiar Covenant, such as was never made with any before, or since; that it was of a mixed Kind; that it had in it Promises and Mercies of a temporal Nature, which belonged to his natural Seed; and others of a spiritual Sort, which belonged to his spiritual Seed: The former are more numerous, clear, and distinct; the latter are comprized chiefly in *Abraham's* being *the Father of many Nations*, or of all that believe, in God being a God to him and them, see *Rom. iv. 11, 12, 16, 17*. Which Observation makes Way for the next Enquiry,

Secondly, With whom this Covenant was made, so far as it respected spiritual Things, or was a Revelation of the Covenant of Grace; as for the temporal Things of this Covenant, it does not concern the Argument. It is allowed on all hands, that they belonged to *Abraham*, and his natural Seed: But the Question is, whether this Covenant, so far as it may be reckoned a Covenant of Grace, or a Revelation of it, or respected spiritual Things, was made with all *Abraham's* Seed after the Flesh, and with all the natural Seed of believing *Gentiles*? This Question consists of two Parts,

1st, Whether the Covenant made with *Abraham*, so far as it was a Covenant of Grace, was made with all *Abraham's* Seed, according to the
Flesh?

Flesh? Which must be answered in the Negative. For,

1. If it was made with all the natural Seed of *Abraham*, as such, it must be with his more immediate Offspring; and so must be equally made with a mocking and persecuting *Ishmael*, born after the Flesh, the Son of the Bond-Woman, as with *Isaac*, born after the Spirit, and the Son of the Free-Woman; and yet we find, that *Ishmael* was excluded from having a Share in spiritual Blessings, only temporal Ones were promised him; and, in Distinction and Opposition to him, the Covenant was established with *Isaac*, Gen. xvii. 19, 20, 21. Again, if this was the Case, it must be equally made with a prophane *Esau*, as with plain-hearted *Jacob*; and yet it is said, *Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated*, Mal. i. 1, 2.

2. If it was made with all *Abraham's* Seed according to the Flesh, it must be made with all his remote Posterity, and stand good to them in their most corrupt Estate; it must be made with them, who believed not, and whose Carcasses fell in the Wilderness, and entred not into Rest; it must be made with the ten Tribes, that revolted from the pure Service of God, and who worshipped the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel*; it must be made with the People of the *Jews* in *Isaiab's* Time, when they were a sinful Nation, a People laden with Iniquity, a Seed of Evil-Doers, Children that were Corrupters, whose Rulers are called the Rulers of *Sodom*, and the People the People of *Gomorrha*,

If. i. 4, 6, 10. it must be made with the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, and that wicked, adulterous, and hypocritical Generation of Men in the Times of our Lord, who were his implacable Enemies, and were concerned in his Death; who killed him, persecuted his Apostles, pleased not God, and were contrary to all Men. What Man, that seriously considers these Things, can think, that the Covenant of Grace belonged to these Men, at least to all; and especially when he observes, what the Apostle says, *they are not all Israel, which are of Israel; neither because they are the Seed of Abraham, are they all Children*, Rom. ix. 6, 7. Yea,

3. If it was made with all that are the Seed of *Abraham* according to the Flesh, then it must be made with *Ishmaelites* and *Edomites*, as well as with *Israelites*; with his Posterity by *Keturah*, as by *Sarah*; with the *Midianites* and *Arabians*; with the *Turks*, as well as with the *Jews*, since they descended and claim their Descent from *Abraham*, as well as these. But,

4. To shut up this Argument; this Covenant made with *Abraham*, be it a Covenant of Grace, seeing it could be no more at most, than a Revelation, Manifestation, Copy, or Transcript of it, call it which you will; it can never be thought to comprehend more in it, than the original Contract, than the eternal Covenant between the Father and the Son. Now the only Persons interested in the everlasting Covenant of Grace, are the chosen of God

and precious ; whom he has loved with an everlasting Love ; gave to his Son to be redeemed by his Blood ; for whom Provision is made in the same Covenant for the Sanctification of their Nature, for the Justification of their Persons, for the Pardon of their Sins, for their Perseverance in Grace, and for their eternal Glory and Happiness : So that all that are in that Covenant are chosen to Grace here, and Glory hereafter, and shall certainly enjoy both ; they are all secured in the Hands of Christ, and are redeemed from Sin, Law, Hell, and Death by his precious Blood, and shall be saved in him with an everlasting Salvation ; they have all of them the Laws of God put into their Minds, and written on their Hearts ; they have new Hearts and new Spirits given them, and the stony Heart taken away from them ; they have the Righteousness of Christ imputed to them ; they have their Sins forgiven them for his Sake, and which will be remembered no more ; they have the Fear of God put into their Hearts, and shall never finally and totally depart from him, but, being called and justified, shall be glorified, see *Jerem.* xxxi. 33, 34. and xxxii. 40. *Ezek.* xxxvi. 25, 26, 27. *Rom.* viii. 30. Now if this Covenant was made with all *Abraham's* natural Seed, and comprehends all of them, then they must be all chosen of God ; whereas there was only a Remnant among them, according to the Election of Grace, *Rom.* xi. 5. they must be all given to Christ, and secured in his Hands ; whereas there were some

of them, that were not of his Sheep, given him by his Father, and so did not believe in him, *John* x. 26. they must be all redeemed by his Blood; whereas he laid down his Life for his Sheep, his Friends, his Church, which all of *Abraham's* Seed could never be said to be: In a Word, they must be all regenerated and sanctified, justified and pardoned; must all have the Grace of God and persevere in it to the End, and be all eternally saved; and the same must be said of all the natural Seed of believing *Gentiles*, if they also are all of them in the Covenant of Grace: But what Man, in his Senses, will affirm these Things? And, upon such a Principle, how will the Doctrines of personal Election, particular Redemption, Regeneration by efficacious Grace, not by Blood, or Will of Man, and the Saints final Perseverance be established? This Gentleman, whose Pamphlet is before me, is said to have written with some Success against the *Arminians*; but sure I am, that no Man can write with Success against them, and without Contradiction to himself, that has imbibed such a Notion of the Covenant of Grace, as this I am militating against.

2dly, The other Part of the Question is, whether the Covenant made with *Abraham*, so far as it was a Covenant of Grace, was made with all the natural Seed of believing *Gentiles*? which also must be answered in the Negative: For,

1. It will be allowed, that this Covenant respects *Abraham's* spiritual Seed among the *Gentiles*; even all true Believers, all such that
walk

walk in the Steps of his Faith; for he is the Father of all them that believe, whether circumcised or uncircumcised, *Jews* or *Gentiles*, Rom. iv. 11, 12, 16. but not the natural Seed of believing *Gentiles*. They, indeed, that are of the Faith of *Abraham*, are his Children in a spiritual Sense, and they are blessed with him with spiritual Blessings, and are such, as Christ has redeemed by his Blood, and they believe in him, and the Blessing of *Abraham* comes upon them: But then this spiritual Seed of *Abraham* is the same with the spiritual Seed of Christ, with whom the Covenant was made from everlasting, and to them only does it belong; and to none can spiritual Blessings belong, but to a spiritual Seed, not a natural one. Let it be proved, if it can, that all the natural Seed of believing *Gentiles*, are the spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, and then they will be admitted to have a Claim to this Covenant. But, though it appears, that believing *Gentiles* are in this Covenant, what Clause is there in it, that respects their natural Seed, as such? Let it be shown, if it can; by what Right and Authority, can any believing *Gentile* pretend to put his natural Seed into *Abraham's* Covenant? The Covenant made with him, as to the temporal Part of it, belonged to him, and his natural Seed; and with respect to its spiritual Part, only to his spiritual Seed, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*; and not to the natural Seed of either of them, as such.

2. The Covenant made with *Abraham*, and his spiritual Seed, takes in many of the Seed of unbelieving Gentiles; who being called by Grace, and openly believing Christ, are *Abraham's* spiritual Seed, with whom the Covenant was made: That there are many among the Gentiles born of unbelieving Parents, who become true Believers in Christ, and so appear to be in the Covenant of Grace, must be allowed; since many are received as such into the Communion of the *Pædobaptists*, as well as others; and, on the other hand, there are many born of believing Gentiles, who do not believe in Christ, are not Partakers of his Grace, on whom the spiritual Blessings of *Abraham* do not come; and so not in his Covenant. Wherefore, by what Authority do Men put in the Infant Seed of believing Gentiles as such into the Covenant, and restrain it to them, and leave out the Seed of unbelieving Gentiles; when, on the contrary, God oftentimes takes the one, and leaves the other?

3. That all the natural Seed of believing Gentiles cannot be included in the Covenant of Grace, is manifest, from the Reason above given, against all the natural Seed of *Abraham* being in it; shewing, that all that are in it are the Elect of God, the Redeemed of Christ, are effectually called by Grace, persevere to the End, and are eternally saved; all which cannot be said of all the natural Seed of believing Gentiles: And if all the natural Seed of *Abraham* are not in this Covenant made with

with him, as it was a Covenant of Grace, it can hardly be thought that all the natural Seed of believing Gentiles should.

4. Seeing it is so clear a Case, that some of the Seed of unbelieving Gentiles are in this Covenant, and some of the Seed of believing Gentiles are not in it, and that it cannot be known who are, until they believe in Christ, and so appear to be *Abraham's* spiritual Seed; it must be right to put off their Claim to any Privilege supposed to arise from Covenant Interest, until it appear that they have one.

5. After all, Covenant Interest gives no Right to any Ordinance, without a positive Order and Direction from God. So, for Instance, with respect to Circumcision; on the one hand, there were some Persons living at the Time that Ordinance was instituted, who undoubtedly had an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, as *Shem, Arphaxad, Lot*, and others, on whom that was not enjoined, and who had no Right to use it; and, on the other hand, there have been many that were not in the Covenant of Grace, who were obliged to it: And so with respect to Baptism, it is not Covenant Interest that gives a Right to it; if it could be proved, as it cannot, that all the Infant Seed of Believers, as such, are in the Covenant of Grace, it would give them no Right to Baptism, without a positive Command for it; the Reason is, because a Person may be in Covenant, and as yet not have the Prerequisite to an Ordinance, even Faith in Christ,

Christ, and a Profession of it; which are necessary to Baptism and the Lord's Supper. This leads me on,

Thirdly, to another Enquiry, Whether Circumcision was a Seal of the Covenant of Grace to *Abraham's* natural Seed; the Writer, whose Performance I am considering, affirms, that it was by God's express Command to be sealed to Infants, and that Circumcision is the Seal of it, p. 10, 16. But this must be denied. Circumcision was no Seal of the Covenant of Grace; for,

1. If it was, the Covenant of Grace, before that took place, must be without a Seal; the Covenant subsisted from everlasting, and the Revelation of it was quickly made after the Fall of *Adam*; and there were Manifestations of it to particular Persons, as *Noah*, and others, before this to *Abraham*, and no Circumcision enjoined: Wherefore, from *Adam* to *Abraham*, according to this Notion, the Covenant must be without a Seal; nay, there were some Persons living at the Time it was instituted, who were in the Covenant, yet this was not enjoined them; as it would, if this had been designed as a Seal of it.

2. Circumcision, in the Institution of it, is called a Sign, but not a Seal; it is said to be אֶת הַכֶּתֶם *Oth*, a *Token*, or *Sign*, *Gen.* xvii. 11. but not אֶת הַכֶּתֶם *Chothem*, a *Seal*; it was a Sign or Mark in the Flesh, which *Abraham's* natural Seed were to bear, until the Promises made in this Covenant were accomplished; it was a typical Sign of

of the Pollution of Human Nature, propagated by natural Generation, and of cleansing from it by the Blood of Christ, and of the inward Circumcision of the Heart; but did not seal or confirm any spiritual Blessing of the Covenant, to those on whom this Mark or Sign was set; it is never called a Seal throughout the whole Old Testament; and so far is there from being any express Command, that the Covenant of Grace should be sealed to Infants by it, that there is not the least Hint of it given.

3. It is indeed in the New Testament called *a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith*, Rom. iv. 11. but it is not said to be a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, nor a Seal to Infants; it was not a Seal to *Abraham's* natural Seed; it was only so to himself. The plain Meaning of the Apostle is, that Circumcision was a Seal to *Abraham*, and assured him of, or confirmed his Faith in this, that he should be the Father of many Nations, in a spiritual Sense; and that the Righteousness of Faith which he had, when he was an uncircumcised Person, should also come upon, and be imputed unto the uncircumcised Gentiles; and accordingly this Mark and Sign continued until the Gospel, declaring Justification by the Righteousness of Christ, was preached, or ordered to be preached to the Gentiles; and could it be thought that Circumcision was a Seal to others besides him, it could at most be only a Seal to them that had both Faith and Righteousness, and not to them that had neither.

4. If it was a Seal of the Covenant of Grace to *Abraham's* natural Seed, it must be either to some or all; if only to Some, it should be pointed out who they are; and if to all, then it must be sealed, that is, confirmed, and an Interest in it assured of, to a mocking *Ishmael*, to a profane *Esau*, to *Korah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, and their Accomplices, whom the Earth swallowed up alive, to *Ahitophel* that hanged himself, to *Judas* that betrayed our Lord, and to all the *Jews* concerned in his Crucifixion and Death; since there is Reason to believe they were all circumcised. But,

5. The Covenant made with *Abraham*, so far as it was a Covenant of Grace, was not made, as we have seen, with all *Abraham's* natural Seed; and therefore Circumcision could not be a Seal of it to them. I pass on,

Fourthly, to another Enquiry, Whether Baptism succeeded Circumcision, and so became a Seal of the Covenant of Grace to Believers, and their natural Seed? This must be answered in the Negative; for,

1. There is no Agreement between them, in the Subjects to whom they are administered; Circumcision was administered to *Jews* only, or such as became Profelytes; Baptism both to *Jews* and *Gentiles*, without any Distinction, that believe in Christ; Circumcision was administered to Infants, Baptism only to adult Persons; Circumcision belonged only to the Males, Baptism to Male and Female: Seeing then the Subjects of the one and the other are
so

so different, the one cannot be thought to succeed the other.

2. The Use of the one and the other is not the same; the Use of Circumcision was to distinguish the natural Seed of *Abraham* from others, until Christ was come in the Flesh; the Use of Baptism is to be a distinguishing Badge of the spiritual Seed of Christ, such as have believed in him, and put him on; the Use of Circumcision was to signify the Corruption of Human Nature, the Necessity of Regeneration, of the Circumcision without Hands, and of cleansing by the Blood of Christ; the Use of Baptism is to answer a good Conscience towards God, to represent the Sufferings, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ, and pre-requires Repentance and Faith.

3. The Manner of administering the one and the other is very different; the one is by Blood, the other by Water; the one by an Incision made in one Part of the Body, the other by an Immersion of the whole Body in Water; the one was done in a private House, and by a private Hand, the other, for the most part, publicly, in open Places, in Rivers, and before Multitudes of People, and by a Person in publick Office, a publick Minister of the Word. Now, Ordinances so much differing in their Subjects, Use, and Manner of Administration, the one can never be thought to come in the room and place of the other. But,

4. What puts it out of all doubt, that Baptism can never be said to succeed Circumcision

is, that Baptism was in Force and Use before Circumcision was abolished, and its Practice discontinued, or ought to be discontinued. Circumcision was not abolished till the Death of Christ, when, with other Ceremonies of the Law, it was made null and void; but, unto that Time, it was the Duty of *Jewish* Parents to circumcise their Infants; whereas some Years before this, *John* came preaching the Doctrine of Baptism, and administred it to Multitudes; our Lord himself was baptized, three or four Years, according to the common Computation, before his Death; now that which is in force before another is out of Date, can never, with any Propriety, be said to succeed or come in the room of that other.

5. It has been proved already, that Circumcision was no Seal of the Covenant of Grace to *Abraham's* natural Seed; and therefore, could it be proved, as it cannot, that Baptism succeeds it, it would not follow that Baptism is a Seal of the Covenant of Grace; there are many Persons who have been baptized, and yet not in the Covenant of Grace, and to whom it was never sealed, as *Simon Magus*, and others; and, on the other hand, a Person may be in the Covenant of Grace, and it may be sealed to him, and he may be comfortably assured of his Interest in it, though, as yet, not baptized in Water. The Author of the Dialogue before me says, *p.* 16. that it is allowed on all hands, that Baptism is a Token or Seal of the Covenant of Grace; but it is a popular Clamour,

mour, a vulgar Mistake, that either that or the Lord's Supper are Seals of the Covenant of Grace. The Blood of Christ is the Seal, and the only Seal of it, by which its Promises and Blessings are ratified and confirmed; and the Holy Spirit is the only earnest Pledge, Seal, and Sealer of the Saints, until the Day of Redemption, *Heb.* xiii. 20. compared with *Dan.* ix. 27. *Ephes.* i. 13, 14. and iv. 30. And so all that fine Piece of Wit of our Author, about the red and white Seal, is spoiled and lost, p. 17.

Upon the whole, we may see what sufficient Scripture Institution for Infant Baptism is to be found in the Covenant made with *Abraham*; since the spiritual Part of that Covenant did not concern his natural Seed as such, but his spiritual Seed, and so not Infants, but adult Persons, whether among *Jews* or *Gentiles*, that walked in the Steps of his Faith; and seeing there is not one Word of Baptism in it, and much less of Infant Baptism; nor was Circumcision a Seal of it, nor does Baptism succeed that, or is a Seal of the Covenant of Grace.

Hence also, it will appear, what little Reason there is for that clamorous Outcry, so often made, and is by our Author, of lessening and abridging the Privileges of Infants under the Gospel Dispensation, and of depriving them of what they formerly had; or for an Harangue upon the valuable Blessing, and great and glorious Privilege they had, of having the Cove-
nant

nant of Grace sealed unto them by Circumcision; or for that Demand, how, why, and when, Children were cut off from this Privilege? Or for such a Representation, this being the Case, that the Gospel is a less glorious Dispensation, with respect to Infants, than the former was, *p.* 19, 20, 22, 30. Seeing the Covenant of Grace was never sealed to Infants by Circumcision; nor was that bloody and painful Rite accounted a rich and glorious Privilege, far from it; especially as it bound them over to keep the whole Law, it was a Yoke of Bondage, an insupportable one; and it is a rich Mercy, and glorious Privilege of the Gospel, that the *Jews* and their Children are delivered from it; and that *Gentiles* and their Children are not obliged to it: And as for the Demand, how, why, and when, Children were cut off from it, it is easily answered, that this was done by the Death of Christ, and at the Time of it, when all Ceremonies were abolished; and that for this Reason, because of the Weakness, Unprofitableness, and Burdensomeness of that, and them: And as for the Gospel Dispensation, that is the more glorious, for Infants being left out of its Church State; that is to say, for its being not national and carnal, as before, but congregational and spiritual; for its consisting not of Infants without Understanding, but of rational and spiritual Men, of Believers in Christ, and Professors of his Name; and these not in a single and small Country, as *Judea*, but in all Parts of the World, as it has been, at one Time

OF

or another, and as it will be in the latter Day : And as for Infants themselves, their Case is as good, and their Privileges as many and better, than under the legal Dispensation ; their Salvation is not at all affected by the Abrogation of Circumcision, or through Want of Baptism to succeed it. As the former did not seal the Covenant to them, and could not save them, so neither could the latter, were it administered to them : To which may be added, that being born of Christian Parents, and having a Christian Education, and the Advantage of hearing the Gospel, as they grow up, and this not in one Country, but many, must exceed all the Privileges the Jewish Children had under the former Dispensation.

C H A P. V.

A Consideration of the several Texts of Scripture produced in Favour of Infant Baptism.

THE Minister in the Dialogue before me, being pressed by his Neighbour to declare what were the numerous Texts of Scripture he referred to, as proving the Continuance of Childrens Privileges under the Gospel Dispensation, meaning particularly Baptism, mentions the following.

1st, The Passage in Acts ii. 39. For the Promise is unto you, and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. This Scripture is often

ten made Use of by our Author, and seems to be his dernier Resort on all Occasions, and the Sheet-Anchor of the Cause he is pleading for. The Promise spoken of, he says, undoubtedly, was the Covenant made with *Abraham*; and was urged as a Reason with the *Jews*, why they and their Children ought to be baptized; and as a Reason with the *Gentiles*, why they and their Children, when called into a Church-State, should be also baptized, *p.* 11, 12. He makes Use of it, to prove that this Promise gives a Claim to Baptism, and that an Interest in it gives a Right unto it, *p.* 15, 16, 18, 29, 30.

1. It is easy to observe the Contradictions, that such are guilty of, that plead for Infant Baptism, from the Covenant or Promise made with *Abraham*, as this Writer is. One while, he tells us, that Persons are by Baptism brought into the Covenant of Grace; and what a dreadful Thing it is to renounce Baptism in Infancy, whereby the Covenant is vacated, and the Relation to the glorious God disowned, they were brought into by Baptism, *p.* 4. And yet here we are told, that Interest in this Promise gives a Right and Claim to Baptism; but how can it give a previous Right and Claim to Baptism, when it is by Baptism, according to this Writer, that Persons are brought into this Covenant?

2. The Promise here observed, be it what it will, is not taken notice of, as what gives a Claim and Right to Baptism, but as an encouraging Motive to Persons pricked in the Heart,
and

and in Distress, both to repent, and be baptized for the Remission of Sins, and as giving them Hope of receiving the Holy Ghost, since such a Promise was made; wherefore Repentance and Baptism were urged, in order to the Enjoyment of the Promise, and, consequently, can be understood of no other than adult Persons, who were capable of Repentance, and of a voluntary Subjection to the Ordinance of Baptism.

3. The *Children*, here spoken of, do not design Infants, but the Posterity of the *Jews*, and such, who might be called Children, though grown up: And nothing is more common in Scriptureⁿ, than the Use of the Phrase in this Sense; and, unless it be so understood in many Places, strange Interpretations must be given of them: Wherefore the Argument, from hence, for *Pædobaptism*, is given up by some learned Men, as Dr. *Hammond*, and others, as inconclusive; but some Men, wherever they meet with the Word *Children*, it immediately runs in their Heads, that Infants must be meant.

4. The Promise, be it what it will, is restrained to as many, as the Lord our God shall call, whether they be *Jews* or *Gentiles*, as well as to repenting and baptized Persons; and therefore can furnish out no Argument for Infant Baptism, but must be understood of Adult Persons,

K

sons,

ⁿ See Exod. i. 8, 12. and iii. 23. and xii. 26, 27, 28, 35, 40, 50. and xiv. 8, 10, 22, 29. Jer. l. 4. and a Multitude of other Places.

sons, capable of being called with an holy Calling, of professing Repentance, and of desiring Baptism upon it; and of doing this, that their Faith might be led to the Blood of Christ, for the Remission of Sin.

5. It seems clear from the Context, that not the Covenant made with *Abraham*, but either the Promise of the Messiah, and Salvation by him, the great Promise made in the Old Testament to the *Jews*, and their Posterity; or the particular Promise of Remission of Sins, a Branch of the New Covenant made with the House of *Israel*, and mentioned in the preceding Verse, and which was calculated for Comfort, and pertinently taken Notice of; or of the pouring out of the Holy Ghost, which is last mentioned: And indeed all may be included in this Promise, and used as a Means to comfort them under their Distress, and as an Argument to encourage them to do the Things, they are pressed to in the foregoing Verse.

2dly, To the former is added another Scripture in *Matth. xix. 14. Suffer little Children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.* Upon which, it is asked, how, and which Way, should we bring our little Children to Christ, but in the Way of his Ordinances? If they belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, they must have a Right to the Privileges of that Kingdom, *p. 20.* To which I answer,

1. These little Children don't appear to be new-born Babes; the Words used by the Evangelists

gelists do not always signify such, but are sometimes used of such as are capable of going alone, yea, of receiving Instructions, of understanding the Scriptures, and of one of twelve Years of Age, *Matt.* xviii. 2. *2 Tim.* iii. 15. *Mark* v. 39, 42. Nor is it probable that Children just born, or within the Month, should be had abroad. Moreover, these were such as Christ called unto him, *Luke* xviii. 16. and were capable of coming to him of themselves, as these Words suppose; nor do their being brought unto him, or his taking them in his Arms, contradict this; since the same Things are said of such as could walk of themselves, *Matt.* xii. 22. and xvii. 16. *Mark* ix. 36.

2. It is not known whose Children these were, whether the Children of those that brought them, or of others; and whether their Parents were Believers in Christ, or not, or whether their Parents were baptized or unbaptized; and if they were Unbelievers and unbaptized Persons, the *Pædobaptists* themselves will not allow that their Children ought to be baptized.

3. Certain it is, that they were not brought to Christ, to be baptized by him; for the Ends for which they were brought are mentioned; *Matthew* says, they brought them unto him, *that he should put his Hands on them, and pray*; that is, for them, and bless them; as was usual with the *Jews* to do; see *Gen.* xlix. 14, 15, 16. and it was common with

them to bring their Children to venerable Persons, Men of Note for Religion and Piety, to have their Blessing and their Prayers; and such an one the Persons that brought these Children might take Christ to be, though they might not know him to be the *Messiah*. *Mark* and *Luke* say, they were brought to him, *that he would touch them*, *Mark* x. 13. *Luke* xviii. 15. as he sometimes used to do, when he healed Persons of Diseases; and probably some of these Children, if not all of them, were diseased, and were brought to be cured; otherwise it is not easy to conceive what they should be touched by him for; however, they were not brought to be baptized: If the Persons that brought them had their Baptism in view, they would not have brought them to Christ, but to his Disciples; seeing not he but they baptized the Persons fit for it; they might have seen the Disciples administer that Ordinance, but not Christ; and from hence it is certain, that they were not baptized by Christ, since he never baptized any.

4. This Passage concludes against *Pædo-baptism*, and not for it; for it seems, by this, that it had never been the Practice of the *Jews*, nor of *John the Baptist*, nor of Christ and his Disciples, to baptize Infants; for had this been then in use, the Apostles would scarcely have rebuked and forbid those that brought these Children, since they might have concluded they brought them to be baptized; but knowing of no such Usage, that ever obtained

tained in that Nation, neither among those that did or did not believe in Christ, they forbade them; and Christ's entire Silence about the Baptism of Infants at this Time, when he had such an Opportunity of speaking of it to his Disciples, had it been his Will, has no favourable Aspect on such a Practice.

5. This Writer's Reasoning upon the Passage, is beside the Purpose for which he produces it; if he brings it to prove any thing respecting Baptism, it must be to prove that Infants were brought to Christ, in order to be baptized by him, and not to him in the way of his Ordinance, or in the way of Baptism; the Reason our Lord gives why they should be suffered to come to him, *for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, is to be understood of such as were comparable to little Children, for Modesty, Meekness, and Humility, and for Freedom from Rancour, Malice, Ambition, and Pride. See *Matt. xviii. 2.* And so the *Syriac* Version is, *who are as these*; and the *Persic* Version, which is rather a Paraphrase, shewing the Sense, *who have been humble as these little Children*; and such are the proper Subjects of a Gospel Church State, sometimes called the Kingdom of Heaven, and shall inherit eternal Happiness. If the Words are to be literally understood of Infants, and of their belonging to the Kingdom of Heaven, interpreted of the Kingdom of Grace, or of the Gospel Church State, according to this Author's Reasoning, they'll prove too much, and more

more than he cares for ; namely, that belonging to that Kingdom, they have a Right to the Privileges of it, even to all of them, to the Lord's Supper, as well as to Baptism ; but the Kingdom of Glory seems to be designed : And we are not unwilling to admit the literal Sense, for the eternal Salvation and Happiness of Infants dying in Infancy, is not denied by us ; and, according to this Sense, our Lord's Reasoning is strong, that seeing he thought fit to save the Souls of Infants, and introduce them into the Kingdom of Heaven, why should they be forbid being brought to him, to be touched by him, and healed of their bodily Diseases ? The Argument is from the greater to the lesser ; but furnishes out nothing in favour of *Pædobaptism*.

3dly, The next Text mentioned is *Matt. xviii. 6. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him, that a Mill-stone were hanged about his Neck, and that he were drowned in the Depth of the Sea.* Upon which it is observed, that the little one referred to was in an Infant State, as appears from Verse 2d, and *Mark ix. 36.* and that little Children are reputed, by Christ, Believers in him : And so here is a full Anticipation of the common Objection against the Baptism of Infants, and a Justification of their Claim to the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith ; as well as a strong Declaration of the awful Danger of offending these little ones, by denying them the Covenant Privileges, to which they

they have a righteous Claim, p. 20, 21, 23, 27. But,

1. Though the little Child, in Verse 2d, which our Lord set in the midst of his Disciples, and took an Occasion from thence to rebuke and instruct them, was in an Infant State, yet those our Lord here speaks of, were not little ones in Age; for how capable soever they may be of having the Principle or Habit of Faith implanted in them, they can't be capable of exercising it, or of acting Faith, which the Phrase used expresses; for if they are not capable of exercising Reason, though they have the Principle of it in them, they cannot be capable of exercising Faith; nor indeed of being offended in the Sense the Word is here used, and to such a Degree, that the Offenders of them had better have died a violent Death, than to be guilty of such Offence. But,

2. The Disciples of Christ are meant, his Apostles, who were contending among themselves who should be greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven; which Ambition our Lord rebukes, by placing a little Child in the midst of them, ver. 1, 2. saying to them, *Except ye be converted, and become as little Children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*; adding, that whoever humbled himself as the Child before him, should be the greatest in it; and that such who received such humble Disciples of his, received him; but those that offended them, would incur his Resentment, and

the greatest Danger expressed in the Words under Consideration, *ver.* 3, 4, 5, 6. And these were such, not only who by Faith looked to Christ, and received him as their Saviour, and made a Profession of him; but preached the Doctrine of Faith, who, having believed, therefore spoke; and who may be said to be offended, when their Persons were despised, their Ministry rejected, and they reproached and persecuted; and, when it would go ill with them, that should treat them in this Manner. These were such, who were little Ones, in their own Esteem, and in the Esteem of others.

3. Admitting that Infants in Age could be meant, and these to have the Principle and Habit of Faith in them, yet this would not justify their Claim to Baptism, which this Writer means, by the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith; though not Baptism, but Circumcision is designed by that Phrase; since actual Faith, yea, a Profession of it, is a necessary Pre-requisite to Baptism, *If thou believest with all thine Heart, thou mayest*, Acts viii. 37.

4. This Writer seems conscious to himself, that Faith in Christ is necessary to Baptism, and is that which justifies a Claim unto it; since he seems glad to lay Hold on this Text, and the Sense he puts upon it, in order to anticipate the Objection to Infant Baptism taken from Faith in Christ, being a Pre-requisite to it; which he knows not how otherwise to get rid of, then to suppose that Infants have Faith, and that this is a Proof of it. But,

5. Supposing this, either all Infants have Faith, or only some: If all; how comes it to pass, that there are so many, when grown up, that are manifestly destitute of it? Can the Grace be lost? Is it not an abiding one? Is not he, who is the Author, the Finisher of it? If only some have it, how can it be known, who have it, and who not? Wherefore, to baptize upon this supposed Faith, is to proceed on a very precarious Foundation: It seems, therefore, much more eligible, to defer their Baptism, 'till it appears, that they do truly and actually believe in Christ.

4^{thly}, The next Passage of Scripture, produced in Favour of Infant Baptism, is 1 Cor. vii. 14. *For the unbelieving Husband is sanctified by the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is sanctified by the Husband, else were your Children unclean; but now are they holy.* Upon which, our Author thus reasons; “ If either
 “ of the Parents be a Believer, the Children
 “ are reputed holy; that is, they have a Cove-
 “ nant Holiness, and have, therefore, a Claim
 “ to Covenant Privileges—they are holy, by
 “ Virtue of their Covenant Relation to God,
 “ and must, therefore, have a Right to have
 “ that Covenant sealed to them in Baptism,
 “ p. 21.” But,

1. It ought to be told, what these Covenant Privileges are, that Children have a Claim unto, by Virtue of their Covenant Relation, this Writer so often speaks of. If Baptism is one of them, as it seems to be his Intention, that must be denied to be a Covenant Privilege, or a Pri-

vilege of the Covenant of Grace; for then all the Covenant-ones in all Ages, ought to have enjoyed it, whereas they have not: And we have seen already, that Covenant Interest gives no Right to any positive Institution, or Ordinance, without a divine Direction, and that Baptism is no Seal of the Covenant.

2. It should be told, what this Covenant Holiness is, whether it is a real or imaginary Thing; it seems to be the latter, by our Author's way of expressing himself. He says, Children are *reputed* holy; that is, have a Covenant Holiness: So that Covenant Holiness is a reputed Holiness; but such a Holiness can never qualify Persons for a New Testament Ordinance; nor has the Covenant of Grace any such Holiness belonging to it; that provides, by way of Promise, for real Holiness, signified, by putting and writing the Laws of God in the Heart, by giving new Hearts and new Spirits, and taking away the stony Heart, and by cleansing from all Impurity; this is real, inward Holiness, and shews itself in an outward holy Conversation: Where this appears, such have an undoubted Right to the Ordinance of Baptism, since they must have received the Holy Spirit, as a Spirit of Sanctification, *Acts* x. 47.

3. A Holiness, appertaining to the Covenant of Grace, can never be meant, since it is such a Holiness, as Unbelievers, yea, as Heathens are said to have; it is such a Holiness, as unbelieving Husbands, and unbelieving Wives are said to have, by Virtue and in Consequence of their Relation to believing Wives and believing Husbands;

Husbands; and which they have prior to the Holiness of their Children; and on which their Children's Holiness depends. Now, surely, Unbelievers and Heathens, will not be allowed to be in Covenant, or to be possessed of a Covenant Holiness, by Virtue of their Yoke-fellows; and yet, theirs, and their Childrens Holiness, must be of the same Kind and Nature. Wherefore,

4. If Children, by Virtue of this Holiness, have a Claim to Covenant Privileges, and to have the Covenant sealed to them by Baptism; then, much more, their unbelieving Parents, because they are sanctified before them, by their believing Yoke-fellows, and they are as near to them, as their Children; and if the Holiness of the one gives a Right to Baptism, why not the Holiness of the other? And yet, our *Pædobaptists* dont pretend to baptize the unbelieving Husband, or Wife, tho' sanctified, whose Holiness is the more near; but the Children, that become holy through the Sanctification of both, whose Holiness is the more remote. For, it should be observed, that the Holiness, spoken of in the Text, be it what it will, is derived, or denominated, from both Parents, believing and unbelieving; yea, the Holiness of the Children depends upon the Sanctification of the unbelieving Parent; for if the Unbeliever is not sanctified, the Children are unclean, and not holy. Besides, the Words are not necessarily to be understood of Infants, or young Children, but of the Posterity of such Persons, whether

of 40, or 50 Years of Age, or of what Age soever; and must be unclean in the Sense of the Word, here used, if their unbelieving Parent is not sanctified by, or to the believing one. But,

5. These Words are to be understood of a matrimonial Holiness; not merely of the Holiness of Marriage, as it is an Institution of God, but of the very Act of Marriage, which, in the Language of the *Jews*, is frequently expressed, by being *sanctified*. Innumerable Instances might be given of this; I have produced one, in my *Exposition* of this Place, in which the Word, קדש *Kadash*, to *sanctify*, is used, no less, than ten Times, to *espouse*. And, for the Sake of those, who have it not, I shall transcribe the Passage: And it is, as follows; “ a Man
 “ מְקַדֵּשׁ *Mekaddesh*, *sanctifies*, or *espouses* a
 “ Wife by himself, or by his Messenger; a
 “ Woman, מִתְקַדֶּשׁת *Mithkaddesh*, *is sanctified*,
 “ or *espoused* by herself, or by her Messenger;
 “ a Man, מְקַדֵּשׁ *Mekaddesh*, *sanctifies*, or *es-*
 “ *pouses* his Daughter, when she is a young
 “ Woman, by himself, or by his Messenger:
 “ If any one says to a Woman, הִתְקַדְּשִׁי *Hith-*
 “ *kaddeshi*, *be thou sanctified*, or *espoused* to me
 “ by this Date (the Fruit of the Palm Tree)
 “ הִתְקַדְּשִׁי *Hithkaddeshi*, *be thou sanctified*, or *es-*
 “ *poused* by this (or any other Thing): If there
 “ is in any one of these Things, the Value of
 “ a Farthing מְקוּדָּשֶׁת *Mekuddesheth*, *she is*
 “ *sanctified*, or *espoused*; and if not, she is not
 “ מְקוּדָּשֶׁת

• Mifn. Kiddurshin, c. 2. §. 1.

“ מקודשת *Mekuddesheth, sanctified*, or espou-
 “ sed : If he says, by this, and by this, and by
 “ this ; if there is the Value of a Farthing in
 “ them all, מקודשת *Mekuddesheth, she is sanc-*
 “ *tified*, or espoused ; but if not, she is not,
 “ מקודשת *Mekuddesheth, sanctified*, or espou-
 “ sed : If she eats one (Date) after another,
 “ she is not, מקודשת *Mekuddesheth, sanctified*,
 “ or espoused, unless one of them is the Value
 of a Farthing.” In the *Misnah*, the oral Law
 of the *Jews*, there is a whole Treatise of
 קידושין *Kiddushin, Sanctifications*, or Espousals ;
 out of which the above Passage is taken. And
 in the *Gemara* is another, full of the Disputes
 of the Doctors on this Subject : And *Maimoni-*
des has also written a Treatise of Women and
 Wives ; out of which might be produced al-
 most innumerable Instances, in Proof of the
 Observation ; and such, as can read, and have
 Leisure to read the said Tracts, may fully
 satisfy themselves in this Matter. And in the
 same Sense, the Apostle uses the Word *αγιαζω*
agiazō, here : And the Passage should be ren-
 dred thus ; *the unbelieving Husband is espoused,*
or married to the Wife, or rather has been espou-
sed ; for it relates to the Act of Marriage past,
 as valid ; *and the unbelieving Wife has been es-*
poused to the Husband. The Preposition *εν* *en*,
 translated *by*, should be rendred *to*, as it is in
 the very next Verse, *God hath called us εν ειρηνη,*
En Eirene, to Peace. The Passage is introdu-
 ced, to support the Advice, the Apostle had
 given to Believers married to Unbelievers, not
 to

to depart from them, but live with them, who had had some Scruple upon their Minds, whether they ought to cohabit with them, being Unbelievers; he advises them, by all Means, to dwell with them, unless the Unbeliever departed, seeing they were duly, rightly, and legally espoused to each other; and, therefore, ought not, notwithstanding their different Sentiments of Religion, to separate from one another; otherwise, if they were not truly married to one another, as such a Departure and Separation would suggest, this Consequence must necessarily follow, that Children, born in such a State of Cohabitation, where the Marriage is not valid, must be spurious, and not legitimate: Which is the Sense of the next Clause, *else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy*; that is, they would have been accounted illegitimate, but now legitimate. And,

6. This Sense of the Words is not novel, nor singular: It is agreeable to the Minds of several Interpreters, ancient and modern, as *Jerom, Ambrose, Erasmus, Camerarius, Musculus*; and others: Which last Writer, and who was a zealous *Pædobaptist*, makes this ingenuous Confession; “formerly, says he, I have abused this Place against the *Anabaptists*, thinking the Meaning was, that the Children were holy for the Parents Faith; which, though true, the present Place makes nothing for the Purpose.”

5thly, To all which, this Writer adds the Commission in *Matth. xxviii. 19. Go teach all Nations,*

Nations, baptizing them, &c. Concerning which, he says, that as the Commission to the sacred Ministry enjoined the baptizing of *all Nations*, whereof Infants are a very great Part; it also enjoined the baptizing Infants, as a Part of the Nations they were to *disciple and baptize*, p. 21. And, elsewhere, he says, the Words ought to be read, *go, disciple all Nations, baptizing them*—and should be understood, as requiring the Ministers of the Gospel to make all Nations Disciples by baptizing them—whereby every one is constituted a *Learner* of Christ: And to prove, that Infants are called Disciples, he refers to *Acts* xv. 10. *Why tempt ye God to put a Yoke on the Neck of the Disciples, &c.* and to all such Scriptures, that respect the Education of Children, p. 24, 25. But,

1. The Commission does not enjoin the baptizing of all Nations, but the baptizing of such, as are taught; for the antecedent to the relative *them* cannot be *all Nations*, since *παντα τα εθνη*, *panta ta ethne*, the Words for *all Nations*, are of the neuter Gender; whereas *αυτους αυτους*, *them*, is of the masculine; but *μαθητας*, *Matheutas*, *Disciples*, is supposed and contained in the Word *μαθητευσατε*, *Matheteusate*, *teach*, or *make Disciples*; such as are first taught, or made Disciples by teaching under the Ministry of the Word, by the Spirit of God, Christ's Orders are to baptize them.

2. If Infants, as a Part of all Nations, were to be baptized, and because they are such; then the Infants of Heathens, *Turks* and *Jews*, ought to

to be baptized, for they are a Part of all Nations, as well as the Children of Christians, or Believers.

3. We are very willing, the Words should be rendred *disciple all Nations*, or *make all Nations Disciples*; that is, Disciples of Christ, which is the same, as Believers in him; for they are the true Disciples of Christ, that have learned the Way of Life, and Salvation by him; that deny themselves, sinful, righteous, and civil self, for his Sake; who forsake all, take up the Cross, and follow him; who bear, and bring forth much Fruit, love one another, and continue in the Doctrine of Christ, *Luke xiv. 27, 33. John xv. 8. and xiii. 35. and viii. 31.* And such, and such only, are the proper Subjects of Baptism; so agreeable to this Commission and the Sense of it, Christ first made Disciples, and then baptized them, or ordered them to be baptized, *John iv. 1, 2.*

4. These two Acts, *discipling* and *baptizing*, are not to be confounded together; they are two distinct Acts, and the one is previous to the other, and absolutely necessary thereunto. Men are not made Disciples by baptizing them, as this Writer suggests, but they must be first Disciples, and then baptized. So *Jerom*^p long ago understood the Commission, who has these Words upon it; “ first, they teach all Nations, “ then dip those, that are taught, in Water: “ For, it cannot be, that the Body should receive

^p Primum docent omnes Gentes, deinde doctas intingunt Aqua, &c. Hieron. in Matt. xxviii. 19.

“ receive the Sacrament of Baptism, unless the
 “ Soul has before received the Truth of Faith.”
 To the same Purpose, *Athanasius*⁹ says, “ Where-
 “ fore the Saviour does not simply command to
 “ baptize, but first says, *teach*, and then bap-
 “ tize thus, *in the Name of the Father, and of*
 “ *the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; that Faith
 “ might come of teaching, and Baptism be
 “ perfected.”

5. Such a Disciple, as this Writer supposes to be constituted by Baptism, namely, a *Learner* of Christ, cannot agree with an Infant. What can a new-born Babe learn of Christ? What can it be taught of him, or receive by Way of teaching, at the Time of its Baptism, or by being baptized? If Learners and Disciples are synonymous Terms, as this Author says, they cannot be Disciples before they are Learners; and they cannot be Learners of Christ, unless they have learned something of him: And, according to this Notion, they ought to learn something of him, before they are baptized in his Name. But what can an Infant learn of Christ?

6. The Text in *Acts* xv. 10. is not to be understood of Infants, but of *Adult* Persons; even converted *Gentiles*, who believed in Christ, and were his Disciples; and upon whom, the false Teachers would have imposed the Yoke of the ceremonial Law; and, particularly, Circumcision: Which, because it bound over to

M

the

⁹ Διαταγο γεν κ' ὁ σωτηρ ουχ απλως ενεειλατο το βαπτιζειν, αλλα πρωτον φησι μαθητευσαστε, &c. Athanas. Contr. Arianos, Orat. III. p. 209.

the whole Law, the Apostle represents as an insupportable one; and calls this Imposition of it on the believing Gentiles, a tempting of God: And as for any other Passages that enjoin the Education of Children, or speak of it, they are never from thence called the Disciples of Christ, nor any where else,

6thly, This Writer asserts, that " it is plain
 " that the Apostles thus understood our Sa-
 " viour's Meaning, and accordingly baptized
 " *Lydia* and her Household, and the Gaoler
 " and all his, *Acts* xvi. 15, 33. and the Hou-
 " shold of *Stephanas*, *1 Cor.* i. 16." *p.* 21.
 But,

1. Seeing the understanding of our Saviour's Meaning in the Commission, depends upon those Instances of Baptism, and so the Warrant for the baptizing of Infants, the *Pædobaptists* ought to be sure that there were Infants in these Families, and that they were baptized, or otherwise they must baptize them, at most, upon a very precarious Foundation; for if the Commission of itself is not clear for it, and those Instances in which the Apostles acted according to the Commission, are not sufficient to vouch it, it must stand upon a very bad Bottom, having neither Precept nor Precedent for it; and they must know, that there are Families that have no Infants in them, and how can they be sure there were any in these? And,

2. It lies upon them to prove there were Infants in these Families, and that these Infants
 were

were baptized, or the Allegation of those Instances, is to no purpose; how they can satisfy themselves without it, they best know; they ought not to put it upon us to prove a Negative, to prove that there were none, this is unfair; and one would think, should not sit very easy upon their Minds, to rest their Practice on so poor a Shift, and so unreasonable a Demand. But,

3. We are able to make it appear, that there are many Things in the Account of the Baptism of these Families, which are inconsistent with Infants, and which make it at least probable, that there were none in them, and certain, that those that were baptized were adult Persons, and Believers in Christ. As for *Lydia*, it is not certain in what State of Life she was, whether single or married, whether Maid, Widow, or Wife; whether she had any Children, or ever had any; or if she had, and them living, whether they were Infants or Adult; and if Infants, it does not seem probable that she should bring them along with her from her native Place *Thyatira* to *Philippi*, where she seems to have been upon Business, and so had hired a House during her Stay there; wherefore, her Household seems to have consisted of menial Servants she brought along with her, to assist her in her Business; and certain it is, that those that the Apostles found there, when they entered into it, after they came out of Prison, were such as are called *Brethren*, and were capable of being comforted

by them, *Acts* xvi. 15, 40. And as for the Gaoler's Household, they were such as were capable of having the Word of God spoken to them, and of rejoicing at it, and in the Conversation of the Apostles, at what was said and done by them, and are even expressly said to believe in God, as the Gaoler did, and together with him; and as for the Household of *Stephanas*, that is, by some, thought to be the same with the Gaoler's; but, if not, it is certain it consisted of adult Persons, Believers in Christ, and very useful in the publick Service of Religion; for they were the First Fruits of *Achaia*, and addicted themselves to the Ministry of the Saints, *1 Cor.* xvi. 15. All which, in each of the Instances, can never be said of Infants. But,

7thly. This Writer adds one Text more, which, he says, must be allowed to be decisive in the present Case, and that is *Rom.* xi. 17,—25. from whence he thinks it is most evident, that since the believing Gentiles are grafted into all the Privileges and spiritual Blessings of the *Jewish* Church, they cannot be cut off from that great Blessing and Privilege of having the Covenant sealed to their Infant Seed, *p.* 21. To which I reply,

1. It will readily be allowed, that believing Gentiles share in all the spiritual Blessings and Privileges of the *Jewish* Church, or of Believers under the former Dispensation; the same Blessings of imputed Righteousness and Pardon of Sin came upon the Uncircumcision, as well

as upon the Circumcision, who walk in the Steps of the Faith of *Abraham*, *Rom. iv. 6,—12.* for such that *are Christ's*, true Believers in him, they *are Abraham's Seed*, his spiritual Seed, and *Heirs, according to the Promise*, of all spiritual Blessings and Privileges, *Gal. iii. 29.* But,

2. The Covenant of Grace was never sealed to *Abraham's* natural Seed; the Covenant of Grace itself did not belong to them as such; nor was Circumcision a Seal of it to them; nor is Baptism a Seal of the Covenant of Grace to any; and therefore it is a great Impropriety and Impertinence to talk of cutting off from that which was never had, and never was.

3. Though believing Gentiles share in the spiritual Blessings and Privileges which the *Jewish* Church, or *Jewish* Believers enjoyed, they never were grafted into that Church; that Church State, with all the peculiar Ordinances of it, was utterly abolished by Christ, signified by the Shaking of the Heavens and the Earth, and removing of those Things that are shaken, that those which cannot be shaken may remain, *Heb. xii. 26, 27.* The *Jewish* Church is not the Olive Tree, of whose Root and Fatness the Gentiles partake; they are not grafted into the old *Jewish* Stock; the Ax has been laid to the Root of that Tree; and it is entirely cut down, and no Engraftment is made upon it. But,

4. The Olive Tree, of whose Root and Fatness believing Gentiles partake, is the Gospel Church State, out of which the *Jews* that rejected Christ were left, and are the broken Branches; and those that believed in Christ were taken in, and laid the first Foundation of it; these are the first Fruits and the Root, which being holy, are a Pledge of the future Conversion and Holiness of that People; they of them that received the first Fruits of the Spirit, were first incorporated into a Gospel Church State, and then the Gentiles which believed were received among them, and were engrafted into them; and this Engrafture or Coalition was first at *Antioch*, where and when, and hereafter, the Gentiles partook of the Root and Fatness of the Olive Tree; enjoyed the same Privileges, communicated in the same Ordinances, and were satisfied with the Goodness and Fatness of the House of God; and of this Engrafture, and of this only does this Text speak; so that it is so far from being decisive in the present Case, that there is not one Word, one Syllable about Baptism in it, and still less can any thing, in favour of Infant Baptism, be inferred from it.

I shall conclude this Chapter, and with it the Affair of the divine Right of Infant Baptism, which, whether illustrated and confirmed in the Dialogue, must be left to the judicious Reader, by observing, that the Minister in it being required to give express New Testament Proof for Infant Baptism, which he was conscious

scious to himself he could not do, in answer to it, requires express New Testament Proof, that *Women* should partake of the *Lord's Supper*, and offers to prove Infant Baptism by the same Arguments that this should be proved. But,

1. We don't go about to prove Womens Right to partake of the Lord's Supper, by such Arguments this Writer forms for us; as by their Covenant Interest, by their Claim to have the Covenant sealed to them, and by their being a Part of all Nations; and though we look upon their being Believers and Disciples of Christ, proper Qualifications for their Admission to the Lord's Supper, when these can be made to appear to belong to Infants, we shall readily admit them to Baptism. But,

2. We prove their Right to the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, by their Right to the Ordinance of Baptism; for they that have a Right to one Ordinance, have to the other; that Women believing in Christ have a Right to Baptism, is clear, from *Acts viii. 12.* *They were baptized, both Men and Women,* and therefore should partake of the Lord's Supper. Let it be proved, that Infants ought to be baptized, and it will be allowed and insisted upon, that they partake of the Lord's Supper.

3. We prove it by their being Church Members; *Mary* the Mother of *Jesus*, with other Women, were of the Number of the Disciples that formed the first Gospel Church at *Jerusalem*; *Sapphira*, the Wife of *Ananias*, was, with

with her Husband, of the Multitude that believed, and were together, and had all Things common; after whose awful Death, *Believers were the more added to the Lord*, that is, to the Church, *both Men and Women*, Acts i. 14, 15. and iv. 32. and v. 9, 14. There were Women in the Church at *Corinth*; concerning whom, the Apostle gives Rules respecting their Conduct, 1 Cor. xi. 5, 6, 13. and xiv. 34, 35. Now, all those that are Members of Gospel Churches ought to eat the Bread, and drink the Cup, in Remembrance of Christ, 1 Cor. xi. 26. Women are Members of Gospel Churches; and therefore ought to eat and drink in like manner.

4. We prove this by Example. *Mary*, the Mother of our Lord, and other Women, being of the Number of the Disciples, which constituted the Gospel Church State at *Jerusalem*, as they continued, with one Accord, in Prayer and Supplication, so likewise in breaking of Bread, Acts i. 14, 15. and ii. 1, 44, 46.

5. We prove this by a divine Direction, Exhortation, and Command, *Let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat*, 1 Cor. xi. 29. The Word used is *ανδρωπος*, a Word of the common Gender, and signifies both Men and Women; in which Sense it must be often understood, as in 1 Tim. ii. 5. for is Christ a Mediator only between God and Men, and not Women? Under the Gospel Dispensation, in a Gospel Church State, there is neither Male nor Female; they are all one in Christ, and enjoy

enjoy the same Privileges and Ordinances, *Gal.* iii. 28. Let the same Proof, or as good, be given for Infant Baptism, and we have done; let it be proved that Infants have a Right to any other Gospel Ordinance as such; that they are or ought to be Members of Gospel Churches; that there is either Precept or Precedent for the baptizing of them, and we shall readily admit them.

C H A P. VI.

Concerning the Mode of Administring the Ordinance of Baptism, whether by Immersion or by Sprinkling.

THE Author of the Dialogue under Consideration affirms, that there is not one single *Lexicographer*, or Critick upon the *Greek* Language, he has ever seen, but what agrees, that though the Word *Baptizo* sometimes signifies to *dip*, yet it also naturally signifies to *wash*; and that washing, in any Mode whatsoever, is the native Signification of the Word *Baptismos*, p. 31. that the Words *baptize* and *Baptism*, (as used in the New Testament) do not, from their Signification, make *Dipping* or *Plunging* the necessary Mode of administring the Ordinance, p. 33. and that one single Instance of that Mode of administring the Ordinance, is not to be found in all the New Testament, p. 34. nor is it probable it should be the Mode, p. 38. and that the Mode of

N
admi-

adminiftring it by Sprinkling is a more lively Emblem of what is fignified and represented by it, than Dipping or Plunging can be fupposed, and therefore the moft proper one.

p. 39.

First, As to the Lexicographers, and Criticks on the Greek Language, they agree that the Word βαπτίζω, *baptizo*, fignifies, in its firft and primary Senfe, to *dip* or *plunge*, and only in a fecondary and confequential Senfe, to *wash*, but never to *pour* or *sprinkle*, there being no proper Washing, but what is by Dipping; and for this we appeal to all the Writers of this kind, and even to thofe this Author mentions.

Scapula, the firft of them, renders βαπτίζω, *baptizo*, by *mergo*, *feu immergo*, *ut quæ tingendi*, *aut abluendi gratia aquæ immergimus*, “ to “ dip or plunge into, as what for the fake of “ dying or washing we dip into Water;” *item mergo*, *submergo*, *obruo aqua*, “ alfo to plunge, “ plunge under, overwhelm in Water;” *item abluo*, *lavo*, “ alfo to wash off, wash;” and βαπτίζομαι, *baptizomai*, he renders, by *mergor*, *submergor*, “ to be plunged, plunged under;” and obferves, that it is ufed metaphorically for *obruor*, to be overwhelmed; and βαπτισμός, *baptifmos*, and βαπτισμα, *baptisma*, he fays, is, *merfio*, *lotio*, *ablutio*, *ipfe immergendi*, *item lavandi*, *feu abluendi actus*, “ Plunging, Washing, Ablution, the Act itfelf of Plunging, “ alfo of Washing or Ablution.” In all which, he

he makes dipping, or plunging, to be the first and preferable Sense of the Words.

Stephens gives the same Sense of the Words, and so *Schrevelius*, who renders βαπτίζω, by *baptizo, mergo, lavo, baptize, plunge, wash*. *Pasor* only renders it *baptizo, baptize*, without determining its Sense. And *Leigh*, in his *Critica Sacra*, observes, that “ the Nature and “ proper Signification of it, is *to dip into Water, or to plunge under Water* ;” and refers to *John* iii. 22, 23. *Matt.* iii. 16. *Acts* viii. 38. And cites *Casaubon, Bucanus, Bullinger, and Zanchy*, as agreeing and testifying to this Sense of it; and *baptisma*, he says, is “ dipping into “ Water, or washing with Water.” And these are the Lexicographers and Criticks, our Author refers us to: To which I may add the *Lexicon*, compiled by *Budæus, Constantine*, and others, who render the Word βαπτίζω, *baptizo*, by *immergo, mergo, intingo, lavacro tingo, abluo, madesfacio, lavo, mundo*; plunge, plunge into, dip into, dip in a Laver, wash off, make wet, wash, cleanse: And βαπτισμος, *baptismos*, they say, is *tingendi, hoc est mergendi Actio, in quo significatu Tinctura dicitur*. “ The “ Action of tinging, that is, of plunging; in “ which Signification it is called a Tincture,” or dying; and another by *Hadrian Junius*, who renders βαπτίζω, by *immergo*, to plunge into; and βαπτισμος, *baptismos*, by *Immersio, Lotio, Baptismus, Immersion, Washing, Baptism*.

As for other Criticks on the Greek Language, who assert, that the proper Signification of the

Word *baptizo*, is to *dip*, or *plunge*; they are so numerous, that it would be tedious to reckon them up: I shall only mention a few of them, and their Words. *Calvin*^r says, “ *Ipsum baptizandi Verbum mergere significat, & mergendi Ritum veteri Ecclesiæ observatum fuisse constat.* The Word, *baptize*, signifies to *plunge*; and, it is plain, that the Rite of plunging was observed in the ancient Church.” *Beza*, who must be allowed to be a learned Critick in the Greek Language, says, on *Mark* vii. 4. “ *Neque vero το βαπτίζειν, το baptizein, significat lavare nisi a consequenti, nam proprie declarat tingendi Causa immergere.* Neither does the Word, *baptizo*, signify to *wash*, unless consequentially; for it properly signifies, to *plunge into*, for the Sake of tinging,” or dying; and “ on *Matth.* iii. 11. he says, *significat autem το βαπτίζειν, το baptizein, tingere, quum παρα το βαπτειν, para to baptein, dicitur, & quum tingenda mergantur.* The Word, *baptizo*, signifies to *dip* (as Dyers in the Vatt) seeing it comes from *bapto*, to *dip*, and seeing Things, that are to be dyed, are “dipped.” *Casaubon*, another great Critick on the Greek Language, has these Words on *Matt.* iii. 6. “ *Hic enim fuit baptizandi Ritus ut in Aquas immergerentur, quod vel ipso Vox βαπτίζειν, baptizein, declarat satis—unde intelligimus non esse ab re, quod jam pridem nonnulli disputarant de toto Corpore immergendo in Ceremonia baptismi; vocem enim βαπτίζειν, baptizein, urgebant.* For this was the Rite
“ of

“ of baptizing, that Persons should be plunged
 “ into Water, which the Word, *baptizo*, suf-
 “ ficiently declares; — hence, we understand,
 “ that it was not foreign from the Matter,
 “ which some, sometime ago, disputed, con-
 “ cerning plunging the whole Body in the Ce-
 “ remony of Baptism; for they urged the Sig-
 “ nification of the Word, *baptizo*.” And, that
 this is the proper Signification of the Word, he
 observes, in his Notes on *Acts* i. 5. and ii. 4.
 To which, I shall only add one more Critick,
 and that is *Grotius*; who, on *Matth.* iii. 6. thus
 writes; “ *Mersatione autem non perfusione agi*
 “ *solitum hunc Ritum indicat & Vocis proprietas,*
 “ *& Loca ad eum Ritum delecta,* John iii. 23.
 “ *Acts* viii. 38. & *Allusiones multæ Apostolo-*
 “ *rum quæ ad Asperersionem referri non possunt,*
 “ *Rom.* vi. 3. *Col.* ii. 12. That this Rite
 “ used to be performed by plunging, and not
 “ by pouring, both the Propriety of the Word,
 “ and the Places chosen for this Rite shew,
 “ *John* iii. 23. *Acts* viii. 38. and the many
 “ Allusions of the Apostles, which cannot be
 “ referred to sprinkling, *Rom.* vi. 3, 4. *Col.* ii.
 “ 12.” I might have here subjoined, some In-
 stances of the Use of the Word in *Greek* Au-
 thors, by which, it appears, to have the Sense
 of dipping and plunging, and not of pouring,
 or sprinkling; but this has been largely done by
Dr. Gale, and others. I shall, therefore, pro-
 ceed,

Secondly, To consider the Use of the Words,
baptize and *Baptism*, in the New Testament;
 which

which our Author says, do not, from their Signification, make dipping or plunging, the necessary Mode of administering the Ordinance of Baptism: And the Places enumerated by him, in which they are used, are, as follow.

1. The Descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles, and on *Cornelius*, and his Company, is called *baptizing*, Acts i. 5. and xi. 16. where he observes, it can't be pretended, that there was the least Allusion to, or Resemblance of, dipping, or plunging, in this Use of the Word. But the learned *Casaubon*, a very great Critick in the *Greek* Tongue, before-mentioned and referred to, does pretend, that there is such an Allusion and Resemblance; his Words on *Acts* i. 5. are these, “ *Et si non improbo, &c.* Although I don't disapprove of the Word, *baptized*, being retained here, that the Antithesis may be full; yet, I am of Opinion, that Regard is had, in this Place, to its proper Signification; for βαπτίζειν, *baptizein*, is to immerse, so as to tinge, or dip: And, in this Sense, the Apostles are truly said to be baptized; for the House, in which this was done, was filled with the Holy Ghost: So that the Apostles seemed to be plunged into it, as into some Pool.” And the extraordinary Descent of the Spirit in those Instances, is much more strongly expressed by a Word, which signifies plunging, than if it had been expressed by a Word, that signifies bare Perfusion, and still less sprinkling.

2. Christ's Crucifixion is called a Baptism; *Mark* x. 38. but, being buffeted, spit upon, and lifted up upon the Cross, says our Author, bear no Resemblance, nor can have any Allusion to dipping, or plunging. But, it is easy to observe, that the Sufferings of our Lord, which are compared to a Baptism, in the Place referred to, and in *Luke* xii. 50, because of the Greatness and Abundance of them, are, sometimes, expressed by deep Waters, and Floods of Waters; and he is represented, as plunged into them, and covered and over-whelmed with them. For so he says, himself, *The Waters are come into my Soul; I sink in deep Mire, where there is no standing; I am come into deep Waters, where the Floods overflow me*, Ps. lxix. 1, 2. And, therefore, a Word, signifying Immersion, and a covering of the whole Body in Water, is a very apt one to express the Multitude of Christ's Sufferings, and the over-whelming Nature of them; and must, more fitly, express the same, than a Word, which only signifies pouring, or sprinkling a few Drops of Water.

3. The Text in *Mark* vii. 4. is next mentioned; which speaks of the *Jews*, when come from the Market, not eating, *except they wash (baptizoontai)*; and of *the washing (baptismous) of Cups and Pots, brazen Vessels, and of Tables, or Beds*, as the Word signifies. And this, our Author thinks, is an unexceptionable Instance of these Words signifying washing, without dipping, or plunging; since it can hardly be supposed,

posed, that they dipped themselves under Water, every Time they came from Market; or, that they dipped their Beds, every Time they sat, or lay upon them. But, in Answer to this, it should be observed, that our Lord is here speaking of the Superstition of the *Pharisees*, who, when they came from Market, or any Court of Judicature, if they touched any common Persons, or their Cloaths, reckoned themselves unclean; and, according to the Traditions of the Elders, were to immerse themselves in Water, and did: So that a most proper Word is here made use of, to express their Superstition. And, as for Cups, Pots and brazen Vessels, what other Way of washing of them is there, than by dipping, or putting them into Water? And, in this Way, unclean Vessels were to be washed, according to the Law, *Lev. xi. 32.* as well, as all that were reckoned so by the Traditions of the Elders; and even Beds, Pillows and Bolsters, when they were unclean in a ceremonial Sense, and not, as this Author puts it, every Time they lay, or sat upon them, were to be washed by Immersion, or dipping them in Water; as I have proved from the *Jews* oral Law, which our Lord has Respect to, in my Exposition of this Place; to which, I refer the Reader. Wherefore, the Words are here used in their primary Sense, as signifying dipping; and, if they did not so signify, they would not truly represent the Superstition, they are designed to do.

4. The next Passage produced, is 1 *Cor.* x. 1,2. which speaks of the *Jewish* Fathers, being *baptized unto Moses in the Cloud, and in the Sea.* Upon which, this Writer observes, that he thinks, he need not seriously undertake to convince his Friend, he is debating with; “ that the Fathers were not dipped in the Cloud, but that the Rain from the Cloud bore a much greater Resemblance to Sprinkling, or Affusion, than to Dipping.” But let us a little examine this Matter, and see, wherein the Agreement lay, between Baptism and the *Israelites* Passage under the Cloud, and through the Sea. Which may be considered, either together, or separately: If together, the Agreement between it and Baptism, lay in this; the *Israelites*, when they passed through the *Red-Sea*, had the Waters on each Side of them, which stood up, as a Wall, higher than they, and the Cloud over them; so that they were, as Persons immersed in, and covered with Water; and, in this View, it is easy to see, that the Resemblance is much greater to Immersion, than to Sprinkling, or Affusion: Or this may be considered separately, as baptized in the Cloud, and as baptized in the Sea; in the Cloud, when, as *Gataker**, a *Pædobaptist* Writer, thinks, it passed from before the Face of the *Israelites*, and stood behind them, and was between the two Camps, to keep off the *Egyptians*; and which, when it passed over them, let down a plentiful Rain upon them, whereby they were

O

in

* *Adversar. Miscellan.* p. 30.

in such a Condition, as if they had been *dipped* all over in Water ; or, when under the Cloud they were all over covered with it, as a Person, when baptized by Immerfion is all over covered with Water ; and they might be faid to be baptized in the Sea, when, as they paffed through it, the Waters ftanding up above their Heads, they feemed, as if they were immerfed. The Refemblance to Plunging, therefore, confidered in either Way, muft be nearer, than to pouring, or fprinkling a fmall Quantity of Water. To which may be added, that the Defcent of the *Israelites* into the Sea, when they feemed, as though they were buried in the Waters of it ; and their Afcent out of it again on the Shore, have a very great Agreement with Baptifm, as adminiftred by Immerfion ; in which, the Perfon baptized, goes down into the Water, is buried with Chrift therein ; and comes up out of it, as out of a Grave, or as the Children of *Israel* out of the *Red-Sea*.

5. The laft Text mentioned, where the Word *Baptifm* is ufed, is *Heb. ix. 10.* where our Author obferves, “ the Apoftle, fpeaking
 “ of the ceremonial Difpenfation, tells us, that
 “ it *ftood only in Meats, and Drinks, and divers*
 “ *Wafhings* (baptifmous) *and carnal Ordinances* ; and the principal of thefe Wafhings, he
 “ exemplifies to us, *ver. 13.* to be *the Blood of*
 “ *Bulls and Goats, and the Afhes of an Heifer,*
 “ *fprinkling the unclean* : Here, therefore, the
 “ Word cannot, with any Appearance of Modefty, be explained in Favour of Immerfion.”

To

To which, I reply, that the Ashes of an Heifer, sprinkling the unclean, were so far from being the principal Part of the *Jewish* Washings, or Baptisms, that it was no Part at all; nor is this mentioned by the Apostle, as any Exemplification of them, who understood these Things better. Sprinkling the Ashes of the Heifer, and the washing, or bathing of the Person in Water, which was by Immersion, are spoken of, as distinct and separate Things, in the Ceremony referred to, *Numb. xix. 19.* and indeed, washing by sprinkling, is not reconcilable to good Sense, to the Propriety of Language, and to the universal Custom of Nations. However, certain it is, that the Priests, *Levites, Israelites, Vessels, Garments, &c.* which were enjoined Washing by the ceremonial Law, and which Washings, or Baptisms, are here referred to, were done, by putting them into Water, and not by pouring, or sprinkling Water upon them. It is a Rule with the *Jews*, that, “wheresoever, in the Law, washing of
“the Flesh, or of the Cloaths is mentioned, it
“means nothing else, than *טבילת כל הגוף*
“*Tebileth Col hagoph, the dipping of the whole*
“*Body* in a Laver—for if any Man dips him-
“self all over, except the Tip of his little
“Finger, he is still in his Uncleaness.” From the Whole, it appears, that the Words, *baptize* and *Baptism*, in all the Places mentioned, do, from their Signification, make Dipping, or Plunging, the necessary Mode of administering the Ordinance of Baptism. I now go on,

O 2

Thirdly,

* Maimon. Hilchot. Mikvaot. c. i. §. 2.

Thirdly, To vindicate those Texts of Scripture, which afford Instances of the Mode of administering Baptism by Immersion, from the Exceptions of this Writer, who confidently affirms, “ That none of those Texts will necessarily prove that any one Person was baptized by Dipping, by *John Baptist*, our Blessed Saviour, or his Apostles.” P. 34. And,

1. The first Text brought into the Debate, and excepted to, is *Matt. iii. 6. And were baptized by him in Jordan, confessing their Sins.* But we don’t argue on this Place, from these Persons being *baptized*, to their being *dipped*, as this Writer makes his Neighbour to do, but from their being baptized *in the River Jordan*; for why should *John* chuse the River *Jordan* to baptize in, and baptize in that River, if he did not administer the Ordinance by Immersion. Dr. *Hammond*, a *Pædobaptist*, thought that these Words afford an Argument for Dipping in Baptism, though our Author will not allow it: His Paraphrase of them is; “ And he received them by Baptism, or *Immersion* in the Water of Jordan, promising them Pardon upon the Sincerity of their Conversion and Amendment, or Reformation of their Lives.” And in his Note on *Matt. iii. 1.* having respect to this Place, says, “ *John* preaching Repentance to the *Jews* in the Desert, received all that came unto him as new Profelytes, forsaking their old Relations, *i. e.* their Sins, and in token of
“ their

“ their resolved Change, *put them into the*
 “ *Water, dipped them all over, and so took*
 “ *them out again*; and upon the Sincerity of
 “ their Change, promised them the Remission
 “ of their Sins, and told them of the *Messiah*
 “ which was suddenly to appear among them,
 “ and warned them to believe on him.” The
 Instances of Washing in the Pool of *Siloam*, in
Solomon’s ten Lavers, or the Hands in a *Bason*,
 mentioned by our Author, are very impertinent;
 and besides, such Washing is not performed
 without Dipping. Who ever washes his Hands
 without dipping them in the Water he washes
 in?

2. Another Text mentioned, is *John* iii. 23.
John was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, be-
cause there was much Water there. Upon which
 this Writer observes, that “ the Words in the
 “ Original are *many Waters*; which implies
 “ many Springs or Brooks of Water; Waters
 “ suited to the Necessity and Conveniency of
 “ the vast Multitudes that resorted to *John*,
 “ as a Supply of Drink for themselves, and
 “ for the Horses and Camels which they rode
 “ upon, as well as for their Baptism. Here
 “ is no appearing of Dipping in the Case—
 “ Had *John* baptized all these Multitudes by
 “ Dipping, he must have stood almost con-
 “ tinually in Water, up to his Waste, and
 “ could not have survived the Employment
 “ but by Miracle.” To which I reply,

(1.) Admitting that the Words in the Ori-
 ginal, *many Waters*, imply many Springs or
 Brooks,

Brooks, this shews there was a Confluence of Water here; and every body knows, that many Springs and Brooks being together, could easily fill large Pools, sufficient for Immersion, and even form and feed great Rivers, which is often the Case; and besides, the Use this Author finds for these Springs and Brooks, requires a considerable Quantity of Water, namely, for the vast Multitudes of Men, and for their Horses and Camels; and surely, therefore, there must be a sufficient Quantity to cover a Man's Body in.

(2.) The Words *πολλα υδατα*, *polla kudata*, *many Waters*, signify a large Quantity, great Abundance, both in the literal and metaphorical Sense of the Phrase, as it is used by the Evangelist *John* elsewhere, see *Rev.* i. 15. and xvii. 1, 15. and by the *Septuagint* Interpreters, it is used even for the Waters of the Sea, *Psal.* lxxvii. 19. and cvii. 23. and answers to מֵיִם רַבִּים, *Mayim Rabbim*, in *Cant.* viii. 7. *many Waters cannot quench Love*; which surely must refer not to a small, but a large Quantity of Water; and which Phrase there, the *Septuagint* render by *much Water*, as we do the Phrase here.

(3.) These Words are given as a Reason, not for the Conveniency of Drink for Men and their Cattle, but for the Baptizing of Men, and the Conveniency of that; that the Men that came to *John's* Baptism came on Horses and Camels, we know not; however, the Text assigns no Reason for the Choice of the Place

Place upon the Account of Convenience for them, but for Baptism only ; and therefore, we should not overlook the Reason in the Text, that is certain, and receive one, which, at most, is very precarious and uncertain ; besides, *John* had not, at this Time, such vast Multitudes that followed him, those followed Christ, and not him ; he was decreasing ; Christ made and baptized more Disciples than he. See ver. 26, 30. and ch. iv. 1.

(4.) Supposing that vast Multitudes still followed him, and were baptized by him, this affords no Argument against Dipping in Baptism ; and especially since this was performed in a Place where there was much Water. Nor was the baptizing of such great Multitudes by Immersion so great an Undertaking, as that he could not survive it without a Miracle ; admit the Work to be hard and laborious, yet as his Day was, his Strength was, according to the Divine Promise. We have had Instances in our own Nation, in our Climate, of Persons that have baptized great Multitudes in Rivers, and even in the Winter Time, and that for many Days successively, if Credit is to be given to our own Writers. Mr. *Fox* the Martyrologist, relates ^u, from *Fabian*, that *Austin*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, baptized ten thousand in one Day, in the River *Swale* ; and observes upon it, that whereas he then baptized in Rivers, it followeth, there were then no use of Fonts. And the same, *Ranulph*, the Monk
of

^u Acts and Monuments, Vol. I. p. 154.

of *Chester* affirms, in his History^x, and says, it was on a Day, in the Middle of Winter; and, according to *Fox*, it was on a *Christmas-Day*. And our Historian *Bede*^y says, that *Paulinus*, for six and thirty Days successively, did nothing else, than instruct the People, which from all Parts flocked unto him, and baptized them, that were instructed, in the River *Glen*; and who also baptized in one Day vast Numbers in the River *Trent*, King *Edwin* being present.

(5.) Though, this Writer says, here is no Appearance of Dipping, in the Case referred to in the Text, yet there are several *Pædobaptists*, who are of another Opinion, and think there was. *Calvin*, on the Text, thus writes; “ from “ these Words, we may gather, that Baptism “ was performed by *John* and Christ, by a “ plunging of the whole Body under Water.” *Piscator*, on the Place, has these Words; “ this “ is mentioned, to signify the Rite of Baptism “ which *John* used, namely, plunging the “ whole Body of the Man, standing in the Ri- “ ver; hence, Christ, being baptized of *John* “ in *Jordan*, is said to come up out of the “ Water, *Matth.* iii. 16. The same Mode “ *Philip* observed, *Acts* viii. 38.” *Aretius*, on the Passage, writes in the following Man- ner; “ but, why, did *John* stay here? He gives “ a Reason, *because there was much Water* “ *here*; wherefore penitent Persons might be “ commodiously baptized; and, it seems to in- “ timiate, that a large Quantity of Water was “ ne-

^x Polychronicon, Lib. V. c. 10. ^y Eccl. Hist. L. II. c. 14.
p. 77. & c. 16. p. 79.

“ necessary in baptizing, that they might, per-
 “ haps, immerse the whole Body.” To
 which, I shall only add the Words of *Grotius*,
 on the Clause, *much Water*: “ Understand,
 “ says he, not many Rivulets, but, simply, a
 “ Plenty of Water; such, namely, in which a
 “ Man’s Body could easily be immersed: In
 “ which Manner, Baptism was then perform-
 “ ed.”

3. Another Text, produced in Favour of dipping in Baptism, is *Matth. iii. 16. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the Water.* To which, is objected, that
 “ there is no more in the Original, than that
 “ our Saviour *went up straightway* (apo) *from*
 “ *the Water*; which Greek Preposition always
 “ naturally signifies *from*, but never *out of*, and
 “ therefore, this Instance can stand in no Stead.”
 But if the Preposition never signifies *out of*, it
 is strange, that our learned Translators should
 so render it here, as also the *Vulgate Latin*, *Sy-
 riac*, *Perfic*, and *Ethiopic* Versions; and so it
 is rendered in the New Testament in several
 Places, as in *Mark xvi. 9. Luke iv. 35, 41. Acts ii. 9. and xvii. 2. and xxviii. 23. and in*
others. And, moreover, it should be observed,
 that this Preposition answers to the *Hebrew* *Min*, which signifies *out of*, as well as *from*;
 and which the *Syriac* Version uses here: And,
 as a Proof of both, let *Pf. xl. 2.* be consulted, and
 the *Septuagint* Version of it, where *David* says,
 the Lord brought him up out of an horrible Pit,

ἐκ ἀπο πηλυ ἰλουος (*ki apo pelou iluos*) and out of the miry Clay. And, if our Lord came up out of the Water, it is a clear Case, that he must have been in it; that he went down into it, in Order to be baptized; and that he was baptized in it: And, is it reasonable to think, he should be baptized in the River *Jordan*, in any other Way, than by Immersion? See the Note of *Piscator*, upon the preceding Text.

4. *Acts* viii. 38, 39. goes in Company with the former; and they went down both into the Water—and when they were come up out of the Water. And the following Remark is made; “there can be no more proved from this Text, “than that *Philip* and the Eunuch went down “to the Water, and came up from it. The Pre- “position (*eis*) rendred *into*, naturally signifies “unto, and is commonly so used in the New “Testament—and the Preposition (*ek*) rendred out of, properly signifies from—so that “there is no Evidence from this Text, that the “Eunuch was baptized by dipping.” Here our Author seems to have in View, a very false Piece of Criticism, frequently used upon this Text; as if the going down into the Water signified no more, than going down to the Bank of the Water, to the Water-side: And, to support which, his Sense of the Preposition, which he would have rendred *unto*, is calculated. But, it should be observed, that the Historian relates in *ver.* 36. that, before this, they were come to a certain Water, to the Water-Side; and, there-

therefore, this, their going down, must be into it. Wherefore, as it cannot be denied, but that this Preposition frequently signifies *into*, it must have this Signification here; and this determines, and settles the Sense of the other Preposition, and shews, that that must be rendered, as it is, *out of*; seeing, whereas they went down into the Water, when they came up, it must be out of it: All which gives Evidence, that the Eunuch was baptized by dipping. *Calvin* thought so, who, on the Text, has these Words; “ *hic perspicimus, &c.* Here we see, “ what was the Manner of baptizing with the “ Antients, for they plunged the whole Body “ into Water.”

5. The last Text, mentioned in the Debate, is *Rom. vi. 4.* *We are buried with him by Baptism into Death.* Where Baptism is called a Burial; a Burial with Christ, a Representation and Resemblance of his; which it cannot be, unless it is administered by Dipping. But this Writer observes, it is also said, *we are baptized into Christ's Death*; and asks, “ what Resemblance is there in Baptism to Christ's dying “ upon the Cross, if we are baptized by Dipping? Was there any Thing like Dipping in “ our Saviour's Crucifixion?—Would you have “ such a Manner of Death resembled in Baptism, by drowning Men when you baptize “ them? And affirms, that this Text has no “ Reference at all, to the Imitation, either of “ Christ's Death or Burial, or to any particu-

“ lar Mode of administring that Ordinance ;
 “ but the Scope is to shew us our Obligation,
 “ by Baptism, unto a Conformity to the Death
 “ and Resurrection of Christ, by dying unto
 “ Sin, and rising again unto Newness of Life.”

But, we have seen already, that there is a Resemblance between the Crucifixion and Death of Christ and Baptism, as administred by Dipping. The overwhelming Sufferings of Christ are fitly signified, by a Person's being plunged into Water ; and a great Likeness there is between the Burial of Christ and Baptism, as performed by Immersion : And, indeed, there is no other Mode of administring that Ordinance, that can represent a Burial, but Immersion. And be it so, that the Scope of the Place is to shew us our Obligation, by Baptism, unto a Conformity to the Death and Resurrection of Christ, by dying unto Sin, and rising again to Newness of Life ; then that Ordinance ought to be so administred, that it may represent unto us, the Death and Resurrection of Christ, and our dying unto Sin, and rising unto Newness of Life ; which are done, in a most lively Manner, by an Immersion into Water, and an Emerision out of it. And, that there is an Allusion, in this Passage, to the primitive Mode of baptizing by Dipping, is acknowledged by many Divines and Annotators ; too many, to recite : I'll just mention two, or three. The *Assembly of Divines*, on this Place, say, “ in this Phrase, the
 “ Apostle seemeth to allude to the ancient
 “ Manner

“ Manner of Baptism ; which was to dip the
 “ Parties baptized, and, as it were, to bury
 “ them under the Water, for a while ; and
 “ then to draw them out of it, and lift them
 “ up, to represent the Burial of our Old Man,
 “ and our Resurrection to Newness of Life.”

Dr. *Hammond*'s Paraphrase of the Words, is this ;

“ 'tis a Thing, that every Christian knows,
 “ that the Immersion in Baptism, refers to the
 “ Death of Christ ; the putting the Person
 “ baptized into the Water, denotes and pro-
 “ claims the Death and Burial of Christ ; and
 “ signifies our Undertaking in Baptism, that we
 “ will give over all the Sins of our former
 “ Lives (which is our being buried together
 “ with Christ, or baptized into his Death) that
 “ so we may live that regenerate new Life
 “ (answerable to Christ's Resurrection) which
 “ consists in a Course of all Sanctity, a constant
 “ Christian Walk all our Days.” So *Piscator*,
 on the Text, “ *videtur respicere ad veterem*
 “ *Ritum*, &c. It seems to respect the ancient
 “ Rite, when, in the whole Body, they were
 “ plunged into Water, and so were, as if they
 “ had been buried ; and immediately were
 “ drawn out again, as out of a Grave.” But,

Fourthly, This Writer thinks, it is not probable, from the Instances of administering this Ordinance in Scripture, that it was performed by Dipping. And,

1. He observes, “ that in *Acts* ii. 41. there
 “ were three Thousand baptized in *Jerusalem*,
 “ in

“ in one Day ; most certainly, adds he, to-
 “ wards the Close of the Day ; and asks, was
 “ there any Probability (I had almost said Pos-
 “ sibility) that they should all be baptized by
 “ Dipping, in so short a Time ? Or, is it pro-
 “ bable that they could so suddenly find Wa-
 “ ter sufficient in that City, for the dipping of
 “ such a Multitude ; especially while they
 “ were so firmly attached to the ceremonial
 “ Institution, which made it unlawful for two
 “ Persons to be dipped in the same Vessel of
 “ Water.” To which I reply,

(1.) That though three thousand were added to the Church, on one and the same Day, it does not necessarily follow from the Text, that they were all baptized in one Day, the Words do not oblige to such a Sense ; I am indeed willing to allow it, and am of Opinion they were baptized in one Day ; though it does not appear that it was most certainly at the Close of the Day, as this Writer affirms ; for it was but the third Hour, or Nine o’Clock in the Morning, when *Peter* began his Sermon, which does not seem to be a long one ; and when that was ended, after some Discourse with the converted Persons, and Exhortations to them, this Ordinance was administred ; and if *Austin*, as we have seen from our Historians, could baptize ten thousand in a short Winter Day, it need not seem improbable, and much less impossible, that three thousand should be baptized, even at the Close of a Day ; when it is considered

sidered that there were twelve Apostles to administer Baptism to them, and it was but two hundred and fifty Persons a-piece; and besides, there were the seventy Disciples, who were Administrators of this Ordinance; and supposing them all employed, they would have no more than six or seven and thirty Persons a-piece to baptize; and as for the Difference between administering the Ordinance by Dipping, and by Sprinkling, it is very inconsiderable; for the same Form of Words must be pronounced in administering it one Way as another; and a Person being ready, is very near as soon dipped into Water, as Water can be taken and sprinkled or poured on his Face. And,

(2.) Whereas a Difficulty is made of finding suddenly Water sufficient in the City of *Jerusalem*, for the Dipping of such a Multitude; it should be observed, that besides Baths in private Houses, for Purification by Immersion, in case of Menstrua's, Gonorrhæa's, &c. there were in the Temple an Apartment called the Dipping-Room, for the High-Priest to dip himself in, on the Day of Atonement; and there were ten Lavers of Brass, each of which held forty Baths of Water, sufficient for the Immersion of the whole Body of a Man; and there was the Molten Sea, for the Priests to wash in, which was done by Immersion; and there were also several Pools in the City, as the Pools of *Bethesda*, *Siloam*, &c. where Persons bathed

bathed or dipped themselves, on certain Occasions: So that there were Conveniencies enough for Baptism by Immersion, in this Place. And,

(3.) As for what this Author says, that according to the ceremonial Institution, it was unlawful for two Persons to be dipped in the same Vessel of Water, I must own my Ignorance of it, till some Proof is given; the Laver in the Temple was in common for the Priests.

2. The Narrative of *Paul's* Baptism, he says, makes it appear to be administered in his Bed-Room, *Acts* ix. 9, 18. but that he was in his Bed-Room when *Ananias* came to him, is not so clear; however, certain it is, that he *arose*, and was baptized. Whether he arose off of his Bed, or off of his Chair, cannot be said; but be that as it will, had the Ordinance been to have been performed by sprinkling or pouring a little Water on him, he need not have rose up from either; but he arose, and went either to a Bath that might be in *Judas's* House, fit for such a Purpose, or to some certain Place without Doors, convenient for the Administration of the Ordinance.

3. The Words of the Text, *Acts* x. 47. *Can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be baptized?* he says, seem plainly to contradict the Dipping of *Cornelius* and his Household. But why so? there is nothing in the Text contradicts it; for the Sense is, Can any Man forbid the Use of his River or Bath, or
what

what Conveniency he might have, for the baptizing of Persons? Which shews, that it required a Place of some Quantity of Water, sufficient for baptizing by Immersion; otherwise it would not have been in the Power of any Man to hinder them having a little Water, to be sprinkled or poured on the Face. And what follows confirms it; *And he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord*; besides, the Words of the Text may be rendered, *Can any Man forbid that these should be baptized with Water?* See *Erasmus* on the Place. Wherefore, what this Writer says, that the Apostle did not speak of forbidding the Water to run in the River, or to remain in any other Receptacle or Reservoir of Water, and therefore must speak of bringing Water for their Baptism, is very impertinent and ridiculous.

4. He observes, that “ the Gaoler and his
 “ Household were baptized in the Dead of the
 “ Night, in the same Hour of his Conversion
 “ by the Earthquake; and therefore, there
 “ was no Probability (nor indeed Possibility)
 “ of their going to any Depth of Water for
 “ that Purpose, *Acts* xvi. 33.” But where
 is the Impossibility, or Improbability of it? *Grotius* thinks it probable, that there was a Pool in the Prison, where he washed the Stripes of the Apostles, and here the Ordinance might be administred; but, if not, it is not unreasonable to suppose, that they went out of

Q

the

the Prison, to the River near the City, where the Oratory, or Place of Prayer was, ver. 13. and there administer the Ordinance, and then return to the Prison again, before Morning, unobserved by any. Compare ver. 30. and 34. together : And now let it be considered, whether these Instances, as our Author says, are sufficient to convince an unprejudiced Person, that the Ordinance was not administered by Dipping, in the Apostolick Times.

5. He concludes, that seeing Sprinkling was the greatest Purification among the *Jews*, and the Blood of Christ, and the Influences of the Holy Spirit, are frequently represented by Sprinkling, but never by Dipping ; therefore, it must be the most proper Mode of Administration. But,

1. It must be denied, that Sprinkling was the greatest Purification among the *Jews* ; their principal Purifications, and which were most frequently used in Cases of Ceremonial Uncleaness, were performed by Immerfion, and therefore they are called *Washings*, or *Baptisms*, in *Heb.* ix. 10. and even the Purification by the Ashes of the Red Heifer, which this Writer instances in, was not performed without bathing the Person all over in Water, *Numb.* xix. 19. and which was the closing and finishing Part of it.

2. It is not Fact, that the Blood of Christ, and the Influences of the Spirit, are never represented by Dipping. The bloody Sufferings
of

of Christ, and the large Abundance of his Blood-shed, are called a *Baptism*, or Dipping, *Luke* xii. 50. And his Blood is represented, as a Fountain opened to wash in, for Sin, and for Uncleanness, *Zeck.* xiii. 1. And the Donation of the Spirit, on the Day of *Pentecost*, is also called a *Baptism*, or Dipping, *Acts* i. 5. But, it is not on those allusive Expressions, that we lay the Stress of the Mode of the administering this Ordinance, though they are only such, this Author attempts to mention, in Favour of Sprinkling. Wherefore, upon the Whole, let the Reader judge, which is the most proper and significative Rite, used in the Administration of the Ordinance of Baptism; whether Immersion, which is the proper and primary Sense of the Word *Baptism*, and is confirmed to be the Rite used, by the Places in which Baptism was administered; and by several scriptural Instances and Examples of it, as well as by allusive Expressions; and which fitly represents the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ; or, Sprinkling, which the Word *Baptism* never signifies; and is not confirmed by any of the said Ways; nor does it represent any Thing, for which Baptism is administered. Let it be, therefore, seriously considered, what a daring Thing it is, to introduce into this Ordinance, Subjects which Christ never appointed, and a Mode of administering it, never used by Him, or his Apostles. In Matters of Worship, God is a jealous God. The Case of *Nadab* and *Abihu* ought to be remembered

membred by us, who offered strange Fire, the Lord commanded not. In Things, relating to religious Worship, as this Ordinance of Baptism is a Part of Divine Worship, we ought to have a Direction from God, either a Precept, or a Precedent: And we ought to keep to the Rule, both as to Matter and Manner, and not dare to innovate in either, lest it should be said to us, *who hath required this at your Hands?* and become chargeable with Will-worship, and with teaching for Doctrines, the Commandments of Men.

F I N I S.

4 AU 64

